

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW.

APRIL, 1856.

- Art. I.—*Giambatt. Passeri—Vite de' Pitt. Scul. e Archit. ; che hanno lavorato in Roma morti dal 1641, fino al 1673.* Roma. 1772.
2. *Filippo Baldinucci—Notizie de' Professori del disegno da Cimabue in quà, &c.* Vol. VI. Firenze. 1728. 4to.
3. *The Life and Times of Salvator Rosa.* By Lady Morgan. New Edition. London: David Bryce, 48, Paternoster Row. 1855.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the lustre of Italian art had begun to decline, and, with the close of the century, its brightness departed. But during that last 100 years many eminent painters flourished, as if the arts were unwilling to forsake the land which had so long been their home. In the foremost rank of these great masters, stands Salvator Rosa, one of the most remarkable characters of the age in which he lived; distinguished, not only by daring and original genius, but by a wonderful versatility of talent, which enabled him to excel as actor, musician, poet, and artist. His chequered and romantic career has been often described, and few lives present such varied and attractive materials to the notice of the art-historian. His story has been recorded in the voluminous collections of Baldinucci, Passeri, and Pascoli; and it is from these contemporary sources that subsequent writers have principally derived their information. Amongst his modern biographers, a prominent place is due to Lady Morgan. It is true, indeed, that her ladyship is somewhat prone to exaggerate the genius, and to palliate the defects of her favourite painter, and endeavours to place him on a loftier eminence in the temple of fame, than even his original and splendid talents entitle him to occupy; but of this, perhaps, we ought not to complain, since

her enthusiastic admiration for the brilliant Neapolitan, has lent a vigour and liveliness to her style, and a vividness to her descriptions, which a colder and calmer historian would have vainly striven to attain. One French writer, however, makes no allowance for the ardour of Lady Morgan's admiration, or the warmth of her colouring, denying the claims of her work to the title of a biography in the following sweeping terms :—

“ Parmi ses biographies, nous ne comprenons pas Lady Morgan, parceque, dans son dernier ouvrage, intitulé ‘vie et siècle de S. Rosa,’ cette dame a fait le roman plutôt que l’histoire de ce peintre.”

Poor Lady Morgan! Hard terms these; but the censure is only in part deserved, although it is certainly true that she often seems to forget that a picture must have shadows as well as lights, and too frequently attempts to extenuate the faults which attached to the fine and susceptible organization of her hero.

At the time of the birth of Salvator Rosa, more than 350 years had elapsed since the revival of painting by Cimabue and the shepherd-boy of Vespignano. It had risen and increased with a bright and steady lustre, till, at length, it culminated in Michael Angelo and Raphael; from their era, the light began to flicker and fade, and, when the greatest master of the Venetian school, the illustrious Titian, closed his long career in 1576, the shadows were already beginning to gather, and the long bright day of art in Italy was hastening to its close. There was little of boldness and originality among the existing schools; mannerists and copyists, tame, correct, and insipid, abounded, whose works gave back but a feeble reflection of the genius of their great predecessors, and who were more occupied by petty jealousies, or in asserting the rival claims of their respective schools, than in endeavouring to improve the art of painting. The founders of the Eclectic school of Bologna, and their immediate successors seemed, indeed, for a time, to restore the splendour of the past; but this was but a transitory brightness, for, with the Caracci and their scholars, the promise of this school expired; and Salvator Rosa may, perhaps, be regarded as the last Italian master whose works were distinguished by genius and originality. In other parts of Europe, however, as if to compensate for the decadence of Italy, the art of painting was most successfully cultivated. The schools of Spain, late in springing up, were now fertile in great artists, and were soon to reach their highest development in Velasquez, Alonso Cano, and Murillo. France could claim as her own Claude

Lorraine, and Nicholas Poussin, whilst Holland and the Netherlands could boast of Rubens and Vandyke.

Salvator Rosa was born at Renella, in the immediate vicinity of Naples, in 1615, and died at Rome in 1673. During his youth the republic of art in Naples was ruled by the "Fazzione de' Pittori," or factions of the painters, which were under the domination of Guiseppe Ribera, better known as Spagnoletto, and of his partizans Correnzio and Caracciolo; who, unworthy of their high vocation, did not scruple to employ poison and the dagger to gratify professional rivalry or private revenge. The followers of the Caracci were the artists of whom they were especially jealous. Their own excellence lay in an accurate and powerful representation of nature, often under repulsive aspects, and they envied or despised the nobler expression and finer feeling evinced in the works of the school of Bologna.

The lives of many of the Neapolitan painters of this stormy period were fertile in incident, and full of romantic adventure. The life of Caravaggio, the founder of the school, was unsettled and turbulent; his end most melancholy. At Rome, he killed his antagonist in a duel, and was obliged to fly to Naples, where he achieved many triumphs; but his restless spirit hurried him to Malta, where, in recompense of his noble picture of the grand master, he received a superb gold chain and the knightly cross. His pugnacity, however, was uncontrollable, and provoked another duel, in which he wounded a noble cavalier; he was, in consequence, thrown into prison, but made his escape to Syracuse, and afterwards to Messina and Naples. At Naples he got involved in a quarrel with some soldiers, was wounded, and obliged to take refuge on board a felucca bound for Rome. He was arrested at a little port where the felucca anchored; and, when released, found that she had set sail with all his wealth on board. He then traversed the burning sands under a vertical sun, was seized with brain fever, and wandered through the deserts of the Pontine marshes, till he arrived at Ponte Ercoli, where he expired in 1609, "a year" (says Bellori) "fatal to painting, for in that same year also died Annibale Caracci, and Frederico Zuccaro." Riberas' career was likewise remarkable. He long remained the head of the Neapolitan school, the favourite of the Spanish viceroys, the absolute judge and dictator in all matters connected with art; but quarrels with his wife, and the seduction of his daughter by Don Juan, son of King Philip, exasperated his haughty temper, and, in his fifty-sixth year, he suddenly disappeared from Naples, and his end is yet involved in mystery. The life of Matia Preti, surnamed "Il cavalier Calabrese," affords a third biography abounding in strange adventures and ever varying circum-

stance. He was descended from an ancient family in Calabria, and received the cross of the knights of Malta from the grand master Paul de Lascaris; but was obliged to leave Malta in consequence of a duel, in which he severely wounded his antagonist. Spain afforded him a refuge, and he afterwards travelled in Italy, painting in Venice, Florence, and Bologna. At Rome he again engaged in a duel with a rival artist, whom he dangerously wounded, and was obliged to fly. He then repaired to Naples, when quarantine had been proclaimed on account of the plague, was stopped by a sentinel, on attempting to enter the city, ran him through the body, disarmed a companion, and was at length arrested and imprisoned. He was unknown, had no passport, and was sentenced to death, but saved himself by offering the viceroy to execute the votive picture intended to be placed on the city gates by the committee of the Sediles. His troubles and adventures were, however, not yet over, for he was nearly shot by a farmer whom he had painted as one of the flayers in a picture of St. Bartholomew. At length he was recalled to Malta by the grand master, and commissioned to adorn with paintings the principal church in that city. There he spent the last forty years of his life; his stormy youth was past; he laboured constantly in his vocation, and gave largely to the poor; was made commander of Syracuse, and died in his eighty-sixth year, after having survived seven grand masters. His chief work is the "Martyrdom of St. Lawrence" in the church of the Borgo.

The life of Salvator, also, abounded in that romance and vicissitude which seemed inseparable from the lives of the Neapolitan artists of this period. His father was Vito Antonio Rosa, an architect and land surveyor; and his mother Giulia Grecca, was descended from a family of artists. Both were exceedingly poor; in their experience the fine arts and starvation were closely allied, and they consequently resolved that their son should not be an artist, and, above all, that he should not be a painter. The richest preferments, the greatest powers were then lodged in the hands of the clergy, and it was, therefore, determined that a churchman Salvator should become. The child, however, in spite of his future holy vocation, proved a perfect imp of mischief, and soon earned the name of Salvatoriello; but, even at this early period, the subtle and brilliant organization of the future painter of "Cataline's Conspiracy" displayed its germs in a passion for music and drawing. Like his great Spanish contemporary, Velasquez, he covered every scrap of paper he could procure with rude representations of whatever he saw; picturesque scenery and fragments of antique architecture attracting his childish attention, and showing thus

early the dawning of that genius which afterwards rendered him the greatest landscape painter of Italy. His first inspirations were drawn from the magnificent scenery of Pausilippo and Vesuvius; and, in spite of chiding and discouragement, when shut up to do penance for his wanderings, he covered the walls of his father's dilapidated mansion with drawings from the scenery of his favourite haunts, executed with burnt sticks. He was doomed to expiate this fault by attendance at all the services of the great church of the Certosa, during the season of Lent. One day he brought with him to the church his bundle of burnt sticks, and amused himself by drawing with these upon the blank spaces between the pillars of the magnificent cloisters. Whilst engaged in this sacrilegious employment, the prior and procuratore issued from the choir, ready armed with scourges, with which, at this season, it was their duty to flog the lay brothers of the convent, and a tremendous flagellation, administered with most holy severity, was the reward of young Salvator's devotion to the fine arts. But the love of painting was too deeply seated, too thoroughly identified with his whole being, to be thus scourged out of him. His aversion to the ecclesiastical profession was invincible; and vain were the efforts of a devotee mother, and the schemings of a poor and ambitious father, to alter the fixed bent of his genius. He was sent to the Collegio della Congregazione Somasca, belonging to the Jesuits, and situated in the older part of Naples. Here he studied the classics with enthusiasm and success, and amassed that varied erudition displayed in his future pictures and poems. When the classical studies, so congenial to his fervid and imaginative temperament, were completed, he was obliged to devote himself to the barbarous scholastic philosophy, upon whose quibbles and sophisms, so many noble intellects have wasted their energies. But to him, this study was utterly distasteful; he could not endure the yoke of Aristotle and Scotus, nor that of the Jesuit fathers; and the result was his expulsion from the college, before he had completed its full curriculum. He was in his sixteenth year when he thus abandoned all hopes of ecclesiastical preferment.

For some time after his return to the ruined *casaccia* of his father, on the hill of Renella, Salvator appears to have devoted most of his attention to the study and practice of music. His *canzone* became the most popular in Naples; he himself had a delightful voice, which he accompanied on the lute,

“And tuned the softest serenade
That e'er on starlit waters played
At midnight to Italian maid.”

Dr. Burney, when at Rome in 1770, purchased the music-book of Salvator from his grand-daughter, and in his "History of Music," after commenting on the fact that the historians of Italian poetry, though often mentioning Salvator as a satirist, seem to have been ignorant of his lyrical compositions, he remarks of this book: "Other single airs by Luigi and Legrenze, the words by Salvator Rosa, fill up the volume, in which there is nothing so precious as the musical and poetical compositions of Rosa."

About this time Francesco Francanzani, a talented young artist and a scholar of Spagnoletto, married the beautiful but portionless sister of Salvator, whose first efforts as a painter were made in the studio of his brother-in-law. He manifested remarkable talent even in these crude attempts; but his genius was then, as it continued throughout life, too impetuous to submit to any system of rules or academical training. He soon left his relative's studio for the great storehouse of nature, departing at dawn with the materials for oil painting, and spending the whole day in communion with nature. He not only sketched but coloured on the spot, and to this early practice he probably owed much of the freshness, force, and truth which his landscapes subsequently displayed.

At this time it was the custom in Italy for young artists to leave home in order to make the tour of the most celebrated schools and galleries of painting. This was termed making their *giro*. Salvator complied with the ordinary routine, but in a most extraordinary way. Others might repair to the schools of Rome, Florence, Venice, or Bologna; he determined to be the scholar of nature alone. He loved to wander amidst the wilds of Calabria, the solitudes of the Abruzzi, the ruins of Pæstum, or along those winding shores where, by the blue Mediterranean, lie the ruins of the once famous cities of Magna Grecia. The deep ravines, the rugged rocks, the lofty mountains, the dark woods, the ever varying sky, the storm-lashed sea, were the objects of his study, and the teachers before whom he bowed. He was eighteen when he started on his *giro*, and whilst engaged in studying amidst the mountains of Calabria, the wildest and most elevated of the Apennines, he was captured by banditti, with whom he remained for a long time, acquiring that accurate acquaintance with their costume and manner of life, which afterwards proved so useful to him.

Salvator returned home from his wanderings only to receive the last sigh of his father, and to have the burden of a helpless and utterly destitute family thrown entirely upon his shoulders. He was then a youth under twenty, without friends, money, or

interest. His portfolio teemed with splendid sketches, his hand was rapid and facile, his genius fertile in resources; but the curse of poverty was upon him, and he had to labour all day in a miserable garret, and then to steal out at nightfall to sell his day's work to the *rivenditori* at their own prices, in order to procure a morsel of bread.

At length his fine picture of "Hagar and Ishmael," exposed for sale in the shop of a dealer, attracted the notice of the splendid and luxurious Lanfranco, who had arrived in Naples to execute the principal paintings in the church of the Jesuits. He not only bought it, but gave general orders to his pupils to buy all the pictures they could find bearing the signature of Salvatoriello; and, when he left for Rome, he took this picture with him, and it became the principal ornament of his gallery at La Vigna. Lanfranco's applause brought Salvator into notice, but it also roused against him the envious and ruffianly mob of the Neapolitan artists, who were further exasperated by the satires which he composed and sung in answer to their attacks. Aniello Falcone, however, one of the best pupils of Ribera, and particularly distinguished as a battle painter, became his friend, opened to him his own school, and introduced him to that of Spagnoletto; and from their instruction and example, Salvator undoubtedly derived great benefit, although his love for nature remained as intense, and his independence and originality, both of manner and thought, continued as marked, as before his connexion with these two distinguished artists.

Wearied at last by fruitless struggles for fame and fortune at Naples, Salvator determined to repair to Rome, and set out on his journey thither in his twentieth year. Urban VIII. then wore the tiara, and Lorenzo Bernini, architect, painter, and sculptor, was supreme in all matters connected with art in Rome. Salvator, on his arrival, with his usual independence, kept aloof from all the factions and schools of art. He spent days amongst the ruins of ancient Rome, sketching the relics of departed splendour, or wandered amidst the solitude and desolation of the Campagna. He did not, however, neglect the churches and galleries of art, in which he particularly admired the works of Michael Angelo and Titian. Here, as at Naples, the *rivenditori*, the lowest class of dealers, were his only customers, and he was frequently a prey to the most pinching poverty. He has commemorated the sufferings of this gloomy period in a cantata, a wild and melancholy composition, which is given at full length by Lady Morgan. His wanderings and hardships at Rome brought on a severe attack of malaria, and

he was obliged to return to Naples to recruit his shattered strength by the balm of his native air.

On his return to Naples, the cabals which had formerly obstructed his success, were again organized against him, and his prospects seemed darker than ever ; but better days were in store for him. An old fellow-student, who had been made major-domo to Cardinal Breanaccia, invited Salvator to accompany him to Rome, and offered an asylum in the cardinal's palace. Arrived at Rome, his independence and impatience of control a second time obstructed his progress. He would not enlist himself among the *seguaci*, or followers of Andrea Sacchi, Pietro da Cortona, Nicholas Poussin, or Bernini. He studied much in the Sistine Chapel, where the glorious frescoes of Michael Angelo were yet undimmed by the incense of centuries. His patron, the cardinal, gave him his first commission to paint the altar-piece in the Chiesa della Morte, at Viterbo, of which see he was bishop ; and he also employed him to paint the frescoes of the episcopal palace, the only frescoes Salvator ever executed ; these and some beautiful *quadretti*, or oil paintings of a cabinet size, gradually increased the reputation of their author at Rome. He himself, however, was dissatisfied with his dependant position in the cardinal's household, and after a residence of a year he left him, and went to Naples, where he was better received than before, as the enmity of the Neapolitan artists was at that period concentrated upon the luckless Domenichino, whom they persecuted to death or poisoned. About this time he painted his "Prometheus" and sent it to be exhibited at Rome, where it united the suffrages of the majority in its favour, and this earnest of success, joined to the representations of his friends, induced Salvator to make another effort to establish himself at Rome. The Academy of St. Luke, however, like too many academies before and since, did not regard merit as the only passport to membership, and refused to admit Salvator within its ranks.

The carnival of 1639 was celebrated shortly after his return to Rome, and the lighter accomplishments of Salvator were destined to achieve for him a reputation and success which his daring and splendid genius had failed to obtain. He was an admirable and graceful actor as well as a charming musician ; and his public appearance, towards the close of the carnival, as Signor Formica, a Neapolitan actor, in the character of Coviello, one of the "Sette maschere d'Italia" (Seven Masques of Italy), was received with rapturous and universal applause. All flocked round the wonderful actor, whose racy humour, bitter satire, and Neapolitan patois rendered his performance irresistibly

attractive ; and their pleasure was equalled by their surprise, when the raising of the masque disclosed the handsome features of the painter of the "Prometheus." All Rome rang with his fame. He became the darling of society,

"Gayest in revel, masque, or ball,
He glittered through the carnival."

Private theatricals were then the rage in Rome, and Salvator soon became the most popular and distinguished performer, far outshining Bernini, who, in his capacity of universal genius, had opened a theatre in the spacious hall of the Fonderia of the Vatican.

His success at the carnival was the turning point of Salvator's fortune. Commissions began to pour in upon him, which his wonderful freedom of brush and facility of handling, enabled him to execute with unusual rapidity. He could finish by nightfall a cabinet picture begun in the morning. As a landscape painter he was compelled to enter the lists with his great contemporaries Nicholas and Gaspar Poussin and Claude Lorraine, all then resident at Rome. The progress of the school of the *paesanti* had been singularly rapid ; for, although landscape was cultivated by Titian, by the Caracci and their pupils, and by some of the highest names in the Roman school, it was always subordinated to history. Adam Elzheimer was the founder of the school, considered as a separate and distinct branch of painting. He was born in 1574, and died in 1620 ; and yet, only twenty years after his death, the Poussins, Claude, and Salvator carried landscape to a degree of excellence, which the practice and experience of more than two centuries, has enabled none of their successors to surpass. The pontificate of Urban VIII., which beheld these illustrious rivals assembled at Rome, was deservedly called "Il secolo d'oro dei Paesanti," (The golden age of landscape painters.) Poussin and Claude, for the most part, loved to depict nature under a smiling and tranquil aspect. The serene heavens of the one, the glowing sunsets of the other, represented her as always beneficent, and bounteous, and beautiful. They worshipped nature in the calm ; Salvator in the storm. It was reserved for his melancholy and fervid genius to depict her clothed in gloom, and wielding the elements of wrath and destruction. His views of nature had been modified by the experience of a childhood and youth embittered by poverty and hardships, and by the neglect and opposition which had long thwarted his onward progress. His disposition, too, was strongly tinged with melancholy ; and we need not, therefore, wonder that such a combination of circumstances, led him to

prefer those scenes in which nature wears the garb of a stern avenger, to those in which she appears under the aspect of a kind and beneficent mother. His shipwrecked mariners, and travellers waylaid by banditti, his trees shattered by thunderbolts, his gloomy forests, foaming torrents, wild ravines, and cloud-wrapt skies, must always excite wonder and admiration from their terrible originality and truth.

There was one striking difference between Salvator and his great rivals, a difference which told very much in his favour among the Roman people. They, beyond the limits of their painting-rooms, were ordinary and common-place individuals, whilst he, on the other hand, was scarcely less distinguished as a musician, poet, and actor, than as a painter. These numerous claims to popularity produced their effect, and Salvator soon became generally known and spoken of by the populace as "Il Signor," or "Nostro Signor Salvatore."

Between 1639 and 1647 he painted some of his finest pictures. His "Sorceress," "Prodigal Son," "Purgatory," "Pindar and Pan," belong to this period. He was proud and sensitive upon the subject of his professional dignity, and would admit of no dictation with regard to the subject, or haggling about the price of his works. Of this Lady Morgan narrates the following example :

"A Roman prince, more notorious for his pretensions to *virtù* than for his liberality to artists, paused before one of the landscapes in Salvator's gallery, and exclaimed,

"Salvator, *mio*, I am strangely tempted to purchase this picture; tell me at once the lowest price?"

"Two hundred scudi," replied Salvator, carelessly.

"Two hundred scudi! *ohime!* that is a price, but we'll talk of it another time."

"He then left, and on his return soon after, again inquired the price.

"Three hundred scudi," was the sullen reply.

"*Corpo di Bacco!*" cried the astonished prince, "*mi burla, vostra Signoria*, you are joking! and so *addio*, Signor Rosa."

"Next day the prince returned with, 'Well, Signor Amico, how goes the market to-day—have prices fallen?'"

"Four hundred scudi is the price to-day," replied Salvator. "The fact is, your excellency would not now obtain this picture from me at any price;" and snatching the panel on which it was painted from the wall, he broke it into a hundred pieces."

On another occasion, a singular contest of generosity took place between the painter and the Constable Colonna, who had commissioned from him two great pictures. These Salvator

finished with much care, and then sent them, without saying a word about the price. The constable, in return, transmitted him a blank cheque to fill up with what sum he chose; but this was sent back as it came. A well filled purse of gold was then sent; and Salvator, seeing himself thus nobly repaid, painted two other pictures, but for them the constable also sent purses of gold; a fifth and a sixth picture were then painted and dispatched; and for these too, the constable paid in the same princely way, and, at last sent a gentleman bearing two purses of gold, to wait on Salvator, to thank him, and to say, that the contest between them was unequal, and that he owned himself vanquished, as it was not so easy for him to fill purses with gold, as for Salvator to paint pictures. The artist, however, was determined not to be outdone in generosity, and presented the messenger with a beautiful sea-piece.

At this period, Naples was almost as badly governed by the Spanish viceroys as, at present, by the Bourbon Ferdinand. Then, as now, the people were ground down by taxes, the servants of the government were, then as now, venal and profligate, the internal administration oppressive, and the prisons full of political offenders. The native nobility were systematically discountenanced by the Spanish viceroys, and the flower of the people were sent to shed their blood on a foreign soil, in the endless wars waged by the monarchs of Spain. The viceroys viewed Naples—as the Wagner did England—as good only for the gold that it would yield; and Capelcatro, in his annals states that the Count Monterey, during his administration of six years, had extorted 45,000,000 of ducats. At his departure, forty ships were required to carry away his effects, and 4,500 packages were filled with rich furniture, gold and silver plate, and precious works of art. The people were ground to the dust by these intolerable exactions; and the historians of that time inform us, that, when poor men from the provinces came to the capital, to represent to the government officials, that nothing remained to them with which to satisfy the demands of the tax-gatherers, they received for answer that they might sell the honour of their wives and daughters, and pay the duties with the price of their prostitution.

Fruit, the favourite food of the people, had for a long time been exempt from taxation, but it also was at last taxed. There needed but this: popular exasperation became uncontrollable. The fire that had long smouldered, at length burst into a blaze. The people rose against their oppressors, headed by the fisherman Masaniello, and, at first, carried everything before them. The *gabelles* on all articles of food were abolished, and the viceroy and his adherents obliged to take refuge in the Castello

Nuovo. Salvator was not one to stand tamely by, or to luxuriate in affluence and repose when his countrymen were striving for their liberties. He joined Masaniello; and several sketches of the fisherman-conspirator and his chief associates, are to be found amongst his etchings. Aniello Falcone, Salvator's intimate friend, had lost a pupil and kinsman, who had been murdered by a Spanish soldier in open day; the murderer was protected; upon which, the friends of the deceased, seeing no hope of justice, determined themselves to avenge his death. A band was formed, headed by Falcone, and called in allusion to the tragedy, which had caused its formation "*La compagnia della morte*." Salvator enrolled himself in its ranks, and the whole body offered their services to Masaniello. When the insurrection was at length suppressed, and Masaniello assassinated, Falcone fled to France, and Salvator took refuge in Rome. There he gave expression to his feelings of regret and disappointment at the failure of his country's struggle for liberty by composing his noble poem of "*La Babilonia*," which, however, like his other literary compositions, is more remarkable for vigour and boldness of thought, and for energy of language, than for smoothness and elegance of diction. About this time he also painted two of his most celebrated pictures "*L'umana Fragilità*," and "*La Fortuna*." They were the results of much deep thought and bitter experience of life, and indicated that tendency to melancholy which often threw its dark shadow across the brightness of his career. "*La Fragilità*," represents a beautiful female with her hair wreathed with flowers, and seated on a glass globe; in her arms is a lovely infant, whose twin brother at her feet is blowing air bubbles, whilst an older child is setting fire to some flax twined round a spindle. Above this group, hovers the grim and threatening figure of Death, with this motto "*Nasci pœna, vita labor, necesse mori*." "*La Fortuna*" (now in the possession of the Duke of Beaufort) is a painted satire. It depicts a lovely woman pouring from a cornucopia, a shower of riches, jewels, crowns, mitres, and wealth of all kinds. The candidates for these are represented as unclean beasts, reptiles or birds of prey, who, in their efforts to appropriate the golden shower, have trampled under foot, the symbols of genius, philosophy, and liberty. The ass is decked with orders; the swine wears a mitre; a fox has assumed a cross; and wolves, tigers, and vultures have shared amongst themselves crowns and coronets.

These two remarkable pictures were publicly exhibited, and were received with acclamation by the populace, who were not slow to apply the satire contained in the latter.

"The nose of one powerful ecclesiastic, the eye of another, were detected in the brutish physiognomy of the swine, who were treading pearls and flowers under their feet. A cardinal was recognized in an ass, scattering with his hoof the laurel and myrtle which lay in his path; and in an old goat reposing on roses, some there were who even fancied the infallible lover of Donna Olympia, the Sultana-queen of the Quirinal."—*Lady Morgan*, p. 170.

The cry of atheism and sedition was raised by his enemies, and, to avoid the fatal grasp of the Inquisition, Salvator was obliged to draw up an apology for his picture, in which he disowned all intentions of any personal application; and, even then, it was only the powerful protection of Prince Mario Gighi, the worthy descendant of Angostino Gighi the friend of Raphael, that saved him from the resentment of the powerful body, whose wrath he had thus rashly provoked. The persecution to which he was exposed, in consequence of the exhibition of these pictures, discouraged and irritated Salvator; and he accepted with pleasure the invitation of his friend Prince Giovanni Carlo de Medici, to repair to the court of his brother at Florence. There he was received with the utmost kindness, and an annual income assigned him whilst he remained in the service of the court, besides a stipulated price for each of his pictures. This cordial welcome and the applause which everywhere greeted him, restored the tone of Salvator's mind; he rapidly recovered his spirits, and vied with the cavaliers of the court in the number and splendour of his entertainments. He instituted the academy of the "Percossi," which soon became one of the most brilliant in Italy. Its members consisted chiefly of the guests and friends of Salvator. They were associated for the purpose of enjoying good cheer, witty conversation, and above all, private theatricals, for which Cardinal Leopold de Medici lent his beautiful Casino di San Marco. The pieces produced were composed and acted solely by the academicians; Salvator himself, and Messer Francesco Maria Agli, a Bolognese merchant, being the most talented performers.

An interesting chapter, in the history of art might be written upon the subject of the friendships of great painters with men of distinguished literary merit. The instances are very numerous; and, in almost all cases, the association of their different talents seems to have proved a source of pleasure and advantage. Thus the friendship of Raphael and Angostino Gighi, of Titian and Ariosto, of Tintoretto and Aretino, of Salvator and Baldinucci, and in our own country, of Barry and Sir Joshua Reynolds with Burke, tend to show, both the frequency of such unions, and the mutual benefits which result from them. At Florence, as at Rome, Salvator's friends were

selected from those most distinguished for talents and acquirements. At the memorable *Simposi* which used to follow the performances of the "Percossi," Torricelli, Cavalcante, Ricciardi, Filippo, Aretino, Salviati, Lippi, Minucci, and a crowd of other wits and *sarans*, were wont to assemble round the hospitable board of the great Neapolitan. Amongst these Lorenzo Lippi, the painter-poet, was Salvator's most intimate friend, and the favourite companion of his walks in the beautiful environs of Florence. Lippi was the author of "*Il Malmantile racquistato*," a mock-heroic poem, intended as a satire upon the feeble and mannered literature, which, in the seventeenth century, had succeeded the nervous prose of Machiavelli, and the fascinating poetry of Ariosto. Its success was unprecedented, and it became almost as much the fashion in England and France as in Italy.

It is related of Salvator, that, during his residence at Florence, he was one day discovered by a friend in the act of playing on a very indifferent harpsichord. "How can you keep such an old rattletrap in the house?" exclaimed his friend, "it is not worth a single scudo." "Not worth a scudo?" rejoined the painter, "I will bet you what you please, that when next you behold it, it shall be worth a thousand. The bet was accepted; and Salvator forthwith painted a landscape on the lid, which not only sold for 1000 scudi, but was esteemed one of his master-pieces. On the end of the instrument he also painted a skull and some music books. In 1823 both these pictures were exhibited at the British Institution.

A handsome female domestic, with the title of "*gouvernante*," was at this period an almost universal part of the establishment of the unmarried in Italy. The Pope himself had set the fashion, by consigning the keeping of the keys of St. Peter to the fair hands of Olympia Aldobrandini. Salvator was a faithful son of the church, and Donna Lucrezia was a fine model: what wonder, then, that he should receive her into his house, with the title of "*sua governante*"? Lady Morgan tells us that he always mentioned her in his letters with respect, and that she accompanied him in his visits to the villas of his friends, the illustrious Maffei, and even to the houses of the most respectable ecclesiastics. To some extent, indeed, his letters bear out her ladyship's assertions, and he married Lucrezia on his death-bed; but of this marriage, and of the lady, a French biographer of Salvator gives the following disparaging account:

"Il épousa pendant cette maladie, sa maîtresse, qui étoit une Florentine nommée Lucrezia, qui lui avoit servi de modèle, et dont il avoit eu plusieurs enfans. La répugnance qu'il eut pour ce mariage, fut extrême; cette femme qu'il connoissoit depuis plusieurs années pour un mauvais sujet, et de très basse extraction, en avoit toujours

agi avec lui plus en maîtresse qu'en domestique, ses faveurs partagées entre lui et ses amis, sans trop de mystère, la fit paroître en ce moment, un objet odieux, et qui pouvoit blesser les sentimens d'honneur qui lui avoient toujours été chers. Enfin ses amis et son confesseur y opposèrent que la religion pouvoit leur inspirer de plus fort ; et voyant que les paroles les plus tendres étoient sans effet, un d'eux lui dit avec transport : *Signor Salvatore, questo vi conviene fare se volete andare in Paradiso. Se andar non si può in Paradiso*, répondit il, *senza esser cornuto, converrà farlo*.—Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres. A Paris. 1762. Tom. ii.

After a residence of nine years at Florence, Salvator determined on returning to Rome. His departure was as triumphant as his entrance. Elegies, sonnets, and poetical adieus poured in upon him from all quarters and from the most distinguished names at the Court of Tuscany, contributing to increase the deep impressions of tenderness and regret with which he always looked back upon the happy years he had spent in the society of his Florentine friends.

Upon his return to Rome, Salvator purchased a handsome house, and furnished it magnificently. It was situated on the Piazza della Trinità del Monte, upon the Pincian Hill, commanding superb views of the Capitol, the Campus Martius, the groves of the Quirinal, the dome of St. Peter's, and the vast, but ruined palaces "where the Cæsars dwelt, and dwell the tuneless birds of night." Here, too, amidst the delicious gardens of the Villa de Medici, stood, in the open air, the most glorious statues of antiquity, the Niobe, the Wrestlers, the Venus de Medici. It was a fit abode for a passionate lover of beauty in nature and in art. Salvator's house was placed between the dwellings of Poussin and Claude, who, like himself, in the bright warm evenings of Italy, loved often to contemplate the glorious landscape commanded by the Pincian Mount.

The envy and malice which had so long and frequently embittered the life of Salvator began to display themselves soon after his return to Rome. His genius, his success, his independence, and

" That sarcastic levity of tongue,
The stinging of a heart the world had stung."

had made many enemies, who were not slow to avail themselves of the slightest pretext to assail his principles and his reputation, and these attacks galled his proud and sensitive nature to the quick. He answered, and in some degree silenced his accusers, by the composition of his cutting and pungent satire, "*L'Invidia*." He was also, in some degree, compensated by the flattering circumstance of his being chosen from amongst all the painters of Rome to execute a picture, to be presented by the Papal Nuncio to Louis XIV. This was the superb battle-piece now in the Louvre.

Salvator, at times, appears to have regretted the excessive warmth and bitterness into which he had occasionally been betrayed in his satirical writings. In a letter to his friend Ricciardi, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Pisa, he says, "It is sufficient to tell you that peace has been utterly banished from my mind, on account of those same blessed satires, which ere I had commenced, I wish I had broken my neck." These satires are six in number; the first is on music; the second, on poetry; the third, on painting; the fourth, on war; "La Babilonia" is the fifth; and "L'Invidia" the last of the series. None of them were published until after their author's death: a good edition was brought out in London in 1793, with an excellent biography prefixed by Giovanni Balcetti.

In spite of the immense prices which he at this time received for his pictures, and of the numerous commissions that poured in upon him, Salvator's extravagant mode of life, and princely liberality to his friends, effectually prevented him from amassing money. This extravagance, which his friends had long deplored, and in vain endeavoured to check, was at last arrested by the pointed satire of his friend Paolo Minucci's cook, upon whom Salvator had bestowed the nickname of "Il filosofo negro." On one occasion Salvator was defending his notorious extravagance on philosophical principles, and concluded his arguments by observing, "One thing is certain, 'Il mio filosofo negro,' that in the hour I have fooled away with you I could have earned 100 scudi." His antagonist's reply was ready and pointed:

"Suppose your philosophership lost your voice by a cold, your hand by an accident, or your leg by a fall, Signor Dio, what would then become of this same philosophy? Where then would be our famous Signor Rosa? Signor Rosa, the improvisatore! Signor Rosa, the marvellous painter! Signor Rosa, the poet and actor! No, marry, it would then be Signor Rosa, the cripple! Signor Rosa, the pauper! Signor Rosa, the mendicant! Santa Madre! I see him now standing at the porch of one of our holy churches, with his staff and his poor-box, stunning the good devotees as they pass, with "carità, Signori Christiani, miei!" Philosophy in sooth! I could never see the beauty of that philosophy which leads to the *staff and poor's-box*." —*Lady Morgan, p. 218.*

Such was the effect of this lecture from the kitchen-philosopher, that Salvator, from that time, began to retrench his extravagance, to accumulate and economize; though he was still distinguished for frequent acts of generosity and benevolence.

In the course of the year 1662 he made an excursion from Rome to Loretto, and his intense love of nature is strongly displayed by the following passage in one of his letters to Ricciardi, giving an account of this journey: "There is a strange mixture of savage wildness, and of domestic scenery, of plain

and precipice, such as the eye delights to wander over. I can safely swear to you, that the tints of these mountains by far exceed all I have ever observed under your Tuscan skies; and as for your *Verucola*, which I once thought a dreary desert, I shall henceforth deem it a fair garden, in comparison with the scenes I have now explored in these Alpine solitudes. O God! how often have I sighed to possess, how often since called to mind those solitary hermitages which I passed on my way! How often wished that fortune had reserved for me such a destiny!" During this year he exhibited three fine pictures, at the exhibition of San Giovanni at Rome; and in 1663, painted what he himself called "*mio quadro grande*" "*Catiline's Conspiracy*," now in the Palazzo Pitti, at Florence. This is generally considered the most impassioned and characteristic of his historical paintings, which, as a class, are far inferior to his landscapes; although, with a strange inconsistency, he himself affected to despise landscape, and piqued himself upon his skill as a painter of history, saying to a cardinal who wished to see his landscapes, "*E sempre vani paese e marrinelli, ed io son pittore di cose grandi, di figure eroiche.*"

At the annual exhibition at Rome, in 1668, many of the noblest works of Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci, the Caracci, and their followers were collected together, and Salvator Rosa was the only living artist who enjoyed the glorious but perilous distinction of being allowed to compete with the mighty dead. He exhibited the "*Triumph of St. George*," and "*Saul with the Witch of Endor*," thus, proving, in the opinion of many, that the mantle of their genius had fallen upon his shoulders. In spite of this triumph, however, Salvator was still dissatisfied; he pined to be allowed to paint an altar-piece, an honour which had long been denied him, and which, when at last accorded, transported him with delight. "*Ring out the bells!*" he says in a letter to a friend, "*at last, after thirty years' residence in Rome, of hopes blasted and complaints vainly reiterated against men and gods, the occasion is accorded me of giving one altar-piece to the public. The Signor Filippo Nerli, resolved upon vanquishing the obstinacy of my destiny, has endowed a chapel in the church of San Giovanni de Florentini; and in despite of the stars themselves, he has determined that I shall paint the altar-piece!*"

Salvator's last great painting was "*St. Turpin*," finished in the early part of 1670. In the following year he painted a series of caricature portraits—a favourite amusement with some of the great Italian masters: Caravaggio, Guido, and Domenichino, had all indulged in it. These "*caricati*," were not, what we should fancy, mere coarse exaggerations of individual peculiarities and defects,

but nature boldly and broadly drawn with its foibles highly coloured. His particular friends, at their own request, sat for part of this collection, and Salvator was finishing the series with a portrait of himself when the pencil dropped from his hand, and he found it impossible to continue the undertaking with the same spirit with which he had commenced it. From this period his health began to decline; his fine and susceptible spirit had worn out its earthly tenement; his appetite and digestion failed, he suffered from sleeplessness and fever, and at last a confirmed dropsy appeared, which, with the assistance of an Italian empiric named Dr. Penna, terminated his life in the spring of the year 1673. On the evening of the day on which he died, his remains were conveyed to the church of Santa Maria degli Angioli alle Terme, once the great hall of the baths of Diocletian. Here, with head and face bare, and surrounded by all the funeral magnificence which could testify homage and respect to the dead, lay the body of the greatest landscape painter of Italy, whilst mourning crowds poured in to take a last look at him whom they had long known and admired as "Nostro Signor Salvatore." He was buried on the following day in a grave opened in the beautiful vestibule of the church—fit resting place for the ashes of departed genius! His epitaph was composed by his friend Paolo Oliva, general of the Jesuits; and his most attached and devoted companion, Carlo Rossi, a Roman banker, dedicated a chapel to his memory, around which he hung up pictures from the pencil of Salvator, as the most graceful and appropriate tribute to the memory of the great artist.

Salvator cannot be said to have founded any school, and he left behind him no worthy successor. Bartolomeo Torregiani, and Garguoli, were his best pupils; and his most successful imitator was the Cavalier Fidenza of Rome, many of whose landscapes have been purchased, even by distinguished connoisseurs, as originals of Salvator.

By Lucrezia, he had two sons; and to Agosto who survived him, he bequeathed his whole estate. He had accumulated a considerable fortune during the last twenty years of his life, and his heir succeeded to 15,000 scudi, a valuable collection of books and pictures, a quantity of rich furniture, a volume of original designs, and the MSS. of all his literary works.

Salvator's versatility, as an artist, was very remarkable. He painted successfully history, genre, and landscape; but he was greatest in the last, especially in pictures of a small size, in which the foliage, rocks, water, sky are handled with the utmost freedom and mastery, and enlivened by the most appropriate and graceful figures. His battle-pieces are also very effective, and his portraits excellent. Some of his historical

paintings are well composed, and have great power and expression; but, in others, according to his Italian biographers in Baldinucci and Passeri, the drawing of the figures is incorrect, the attitudes stiff, and the colouring faulty. In the department of landscape, however, he was a true and original genius, the only great one to whom Italy has ever given birth. In that sphere, the grandeur and originality of his conceptions are unrivalled. He delighted in wild mountain scenes, lonely defiles, dark forests, rocky shores, narrow passes leading to robber-haunts, trees rent by storms, or wasted by time, clouds drifting athwart a murky sky, lurking banditti, wandering soldiers, and forlorn travellers. All that could contribute to inspire ideas of grandeur, desolation, pity, or terror was at his command; and he wielded those varied resources with the mastery of conscious power, and the ease of consummate genius.

When we cast a backward glance over the eventful life which we have thus endeavoured to pourtray, it seems like a picture by Ribera, or by Salvator Rosa himself. The *chiar'oscuro* is strongly marked; the lights are brilliant, but they are opposed and contrasted by strong and deep shadows. Proud, sensitive, melancholy, and reflective, Salvator had pondered much upon the great mystery of existence, on the prevalence of evil and crime, and on the unequal division of the gifts of fortune. He could not but hold in contempt many a mitred abbot, scarlet cardinal, and proud baron, abusing wealth and power, whilst he, the chosen son of genius, was for many a long and bitter year, steeped in poverty and doomed to neglect. He was too proud to dissemble, too fiery and independent to conceal what he felt; hence, his satires painted and written; hence the hatred of his enemies and their cabals against him. He was in advance of his age, both as a writer and as a painter; as a writer, for he dared openly to express what others only felt, a hatred of tyranny, of abuse of power and patronage, of pretentious mediocrity, of servile imitation. As a painter, in an age of copyists and mannerists, he struck out for himself a new path to fame and fortune. He early freed himself from conventional trammels; and, original in all things, undertook to represent what none had ever depicted before, the terrible sublimity of nature. Whilst most of the artists of his time were looking backwards, satisfied with what had been done, and pleased with an imperfect imitation of the illustrious dead, he looked onwards, and strove to make for himself a position and a destiny. He succeeded; and, in spite of many faults and failings, has transmitted to posterity the bright remembrance of an original and independent career, in the midst of an age of feebleness and servility.

ART. II.—*The Truth of the Evangelical History of our Lord Jesus Christ, proved in opposition to Dr. D. F. Strauss, the Chief of Modern Disbelievers in Revelation.* By William Gillespie, author of "The Necessary Existence of God." Edinburgh. 1856.

2. *Christ and other Masters; an Historical Inquiry into some of the Chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World.* By Charles Hardwick, A.M., Fellow of St. Catherine's Hall, Divinity Lecturer at King's College, and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. Part I. Cambridge. 1855.

OF all subjects the most interesting and important is that which concerns the exposition and defence of Christian truth. The holy religion which we profess is not only identified with our deepest personal convictions and our brightest hopes, but it has given its peculiar direction and tone to the family, the social, and political life of mankind. Not confined to the speculations of the initiated, or the laborious researches of the learned, it has stepped forth into the world, and everywhere associated itself with, and acted upon, every phase of being. No longer have we to seek for it within the hiding-place of the hermit, the walls of the cloister, or the solitude of the oratory; its name is inscribed on every institution; literature is modified by it; art bears its impress; civilization, liberty, and national greatness run in its channels. In whatever direction we turn we shall find it before us, as the finger-post which points mankind onward and upward. Travels, researches, inquiries, speculations, even conquests and political undertakings, must be traced to its influence or viewed in its light. And how could it be otherwise? The highest problem,—as the great aim of men must ever be towards the realization of those anticipations and deep necessities of which each of us is conscious, and which the gospel alone promises to meet. For more than 1800 years, at any rate, have those whose minds, hearts, and actions testified to their worth, looked to the "Word made flesh," as the Alpha and Omega of their spiritual life, and with it their end and use in being. What Christianity has consciously been to them, it has also unconsciously been to the world generally. In truth, the religion of Jesus Christ has been, and still is, the sun in the mental, moral, and social system of mankind. Perhaps, if they who have so assiduously laboured to displace it from its central position, had reflected that with its removal they would infallibly destroy the harmony of the whole universe, and that along with another luminary as the centre they would require to furnish other planets also with new laws and motions, they might at

least have paused to consider whether their own lamp could have taken the place of God's sun in the heavens.

Let not the reader misunderstand us. We are not adverse to speculation, nor would we have any man take that on trust which can only be real and active as the result of personal inquiry. It is personal *conviction*, and *not tradition*, which constitutes the proper ground of religion. In the attainment of this we have to pass through a mental, or at any rate, a moral contest, which becomes the birth pangs of the new life. As in the case of the individual so in that of society also. If Christianity makes progress, and shows itself as an *effective* power, it meets with and evokes hostile elements, which have in turn to be overcome. The wonder is not that Christianity is opposed in every age; the wonder would be if it could progress unopposed. The various forms of heathenism were not opposed, because they did not contain a principle of new life. They must be viewed as the product and consequences of the various stages of society; not those stages of society as effects produced by them. It has been otherwise with Christianity. From the first it appeared as the leaven which was to leaven the whole lump. Hence, whenever this "light came into the world," "the darkness" which "comprehended it not" obstructed its progress. The synagogue which had entered on a totally different direction from that of "the spirit" of the Old Testament economy, contended against Christ with the energy and determination of an institution which struggles for continued existence. The systems of heathenism met the gospel with that brute resistance which an unreasoning adherence to coarse materialism renders natural to men generally. The philosophy of the ancient world, which in its various directions had developed to its utmost limits, either entirely denied the realities which the "new religion" brought to light, or it mistook them, or else preferred the dim and isolated rays which lit up its consciousness, to the flood of golden light which streamed down from the sun of righteousness. In its contest with this threefold opposition, the gospel displayed its peculiar weapons; it proved itself to be *spirit*, *power*, and *truth*. But although victory has ever since been on its side, the contest has never been ended; nor will this take place till "the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God." The old foes ever reappear with "a new face," and the conflict still lasts.

It will readily be observed that the threefold opposition which Christianity had at first to encounter in the synagogue, in heathenism, and in philosophy, is the same as that of the letter and form, of materialism, and of undirected speculation with which we are, unhappily, so familiar. The opposition of the

letter to the spirit has always led not so much to irreligion as to false religion. It has not been the parent of unbelief, but of superstition—it has given rise, not to infidelity, but to heresy. We do not, indeed, mean to say that *all* heresy has sprung from this adherence to the letter combined with a corresponding neglect and misunderstanding of the spirit. We know that there is one family of heresies which owes its origin rather to speculation, and is an ineffectual attempt to place reason side by side with revelation, and to supplement the discoveries of the latter by the inquiries of the former. But where forms of error are not directly traceable to this refusal to submit absolutely to the word of God as such, they spring on the other hand from a dead formalism, from an apotheosis of the letter and of the outward. We have only to remind the reader of the great repository of heresies, Romanism, to illustrate the correctness of this observation. If literalism thus leads to error, it is the tendency of the other hostile element of *materialism* to obstruct the *practical* progress of the truth. It ever brings the realities which are seen and felt into undue antagonism with the higher spiritual facts. It attaches an importance to them which is neither proportionate to their intrinsic worth nor to their claims when compared with what is supersensual. It offers no speculative, but a practical opposition; it does not raise objections, but it acts as a dead weight in the scale which counterbalances the spiritual. To it we trace the disruption between faith and life, between dogma and fact which manifests itself in either of the two extremes—as an exclusive secularism, that denies, or else subordinates, the highest motives and ends; and as a one-sided religionism that more or less degenerates into cant, and contents itself with an attempt to satisfy the religious cravings or to administer the balm of the gospel by throwing the theological penny to a starving outcast. Parent of much ill, it was the first to make a gulph, at the brink of which it now stands wondering, but which it cannot bridge. It has severed the spiritual from the temporal, and even in its attempts at religion it has only given to the world the idea and term of *secular*; as if to the truly religious aught might or could prove such. The third opposing element is found in speculation. Considering our mental constitution and our spiritual state on the one hand, and on the other the nature of the subjects to be investigated we need not wonder that unaided inquiry will lead to no adequate result. The attempt has been made on various occasions and under various circumstances. But, curiously enough, the same results have always ultimately been reached, however different the commencements of the investigation may have appeared. It seems as if it were necessary to exhibit the ultimate limits of

the human understanding in various thinkers and at various stages of the world's history. These are idealism, scepticism, and pantheism, according as sentiment, criticism, or the study of nature have been taken as guides in the inquiry. The philosophers of the ancient world, those of the Middle Ages, and the speculators of our own days, are equally ranged under these three designations; and, sooth to say, the results of their inquiries, however differently expressed, are the same in substance. It becomes no less true in this as in other departments, that "there is nothing new under the sun." And as the results of these systems, so their modes of opposition to Christianity at various periods are also similar. We have the idealist of old, who in his broad eclecticism embraced Jesus along with Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato; but at the same time controverted Christianity as in itself occupying an inferior stand-point, just as our modern eclectics of the school of Newman and Parker would do. We have the ancient sceptics, who put their sign of interrogation to truth in general and to every truth in particular, just as there are amongst us those who would have us navigate this life's sea with only the wind of natural laws and necessity to drive our vessel before it, without a helm to steer it, a daylight to cheer us, a starlit night to guide us, or a haven to receive us. Mankind, only, under the inflexible laws of a universe—where everything is subject to a stern, unreasoning, impersonal necessity—without a God, without a heaven, without a Christ, without a bible, are like the Ancient Mariner on his spell-bound ship. Twin-sister of scepticism, Pantheism only reverses the proposition of the former. Instead of the formula, "There is no truth, there is no God;" we have it, "All is truth, and all is God." A consistent sceptic must be a wretched being, if the subterranean cell of his logic does not admit a single ray of light from nature or from Providence. Not so the pantheist. To him all nature appears clad in divine beauty—everywhere he sees the universe tinged by the golden rays of the Divine. The mountains take up the hymn, the valleys respond to it, the trees clap their hands, and the broad bosom of the deep reflects his image. All that is—exists, in the truest sense—is a ray of the Divine. Alas! that these rays have no sun, and this light no other focus than the mirror within, which must so speedily be broken. Yet the pantheist of old and the modern pantheist are only disciples in one and the same school.

We have dwelt at special length upon that form of opposition to the truth, which proceeds from unguided, and hence, misguided speculation, as being the most obvious, and furnishing the most direct attacks upon the gospel-truth. We have indicated that the various forms of infidelity were substantially the same,

and that they manifested themselves in similar manner at various periods. In fact, as generally, speculation described a cycle in which, alternately, idealism, scepticism, and pantheism became the prominent points, so it successively passed through various forms as it directed its attacks to various points in the Christian system. It is remarkable, that here also, the same correspondence between the enemies of the truth of old and its modern opponents; may be observed. Once more we have the "old enemies" if not "with new faces," yet with new names. The grounds of attack were of old, as they are now, either those of general opposition to anything higher than unaided reason, or dogmatical antagonism—an opposition to the *doctrines* of the Bible, or critical antagonism—an opposition to the *facts* of the Bible. Necessarily the Bible became the common battleground; and from the days of Celsus to those of Strauss, the same truths and the same facts have been controverted with very much the same arguments, and let us gratefully add with very much the same results.

Before entering more particularly on this subject, let us add a few words to distinguish these attacks of avowed enemies from the reverential and earnest inquiries of those who seek God, if "haply they may seek after Him, though He is not far." In the one case there is a preconceived system by which everything else is judged and determined, in the other there is earnest search after truth; in the one case there is the desire of demolishing a hated religion, combined with a wish after victory; in the other, a desire for personal conviction, with a readiness to welcome its approach, and, at last, to abandon oneself wholly to its influence and power. In the one case, then, an attack is meditated; in the other, a search is instituted. We can, and do sympathize with the truly honest doubter who seeks after light; we abhor and shrink from the conclusions of self-sufficient ignorance and superficiality, which would reduce everything to what can be measured and weighed, and lay the yard-wand of its mental wares to the products of heaven. But how gloriously has the Bible outlived all these attacks! Indeed, if miracle be requisite to prove the truth of our holy religion, none greater can be desired than that afforded by the attitude and position which the Bible has occupied in relation to its various opponents. We hold that it has only suffered them to attempt their attacks. It has not condescended to enter into contest with them; it has always towered so far superior. For centuries has the ingenuity of men tortured itself to discover, either in its pages, or in those of nature or of history, something which might afford a breach for an assault upon the citadel of our faith. Let us for a moment recall to mind from

what various quarters the attempt was made. Geography, history, ethnography, geology, philology, in the world of science—antiquarian researches, minute criticism, analogy, and reasoning of every kind—such were some of the armouries whence furbished weapons were sought. Meantime the Bible first silenced, then outlived, and last recalled them to life, but now has so many witnesses and champions in her cause. And during the time that this contest was raging it acted as it was wont to do in times of peace. It opened its doctrines to the inquirer; it dispensed its consolations to the needy; it pointed out its lessons and hopes to the pilgrim; it moved the wheels of the world's great machinery; it set the clock of history; and still it has survived, and will survive. It has not lost one tittle or iota on its passage down the stream of centuries; like Moses of old, its eye is not grown dim nor its force abated.

We have now reached a point where we may stop and look around us. We know that "offences must needs come," and we are prepared for their reappearance at various periods, under forms similar to those of old, although adapted to new circumstances. In point of fact, what has of late taken place might have been anticipated. First we had our *Deists* who chiefly attacked the *doctrines* of the Bible; then, our *Rationalists* who denied its *facts*. Follow these two tendencies to their legitimate issue, and we reach the two prominent forms of modern infidelity—the universalism of the Parker and Newman school, and the scepticism of the mythical system as represented by Strauss and his followers. In truth, both Deism and Rationalism were shallow, weak, affairs; they were but children who had scarcely learned to walk. The Deist was a wretched pedant, stiff in everything, who tried to laugh, but whose very laugh was grim and unnatural, like the grin of a skeleton. The thorough-paced Rationalist was peculiarly weak and silly. Neither he nor anybody else believed a word of all his statements. Everybody knew that his assertions were unfounded, and, in reality, a dishonest attempt at getting rid of what he did not believe. Then came a period of reaction. First light was dimly seen, and, through the portal of Mysticism, men entered the building of truth, as their ancestors had done before them, at the time of the Reformation. Deism and Rationalism both died. Friend and foe had agreed to commit them to the ground. The system and the works of men like Bretschneider, Paulus, and others, will speedily become only objects of historical curiosity to be perused by the laborious antiquarian. These men lived to see that theirs was but the shortest winter-day. Before they had departed the stage on which erst they had been principal actors, both they and their works were

ridiculed and forgotten. Their place was now taken by the representatives of a bold and outspoken negation. The Deists were succeeded by the Universalists, at home and abroad, and the Rationalists by the Mythists. It was still the same opposition to divine doctrine and divine fact; but this time it was bold and unshrinking. Theodore Parker, R. Mackay, F. W. Newman, and Strauss, Bruno Bauer, and Feuerbach—not to mention a host of others—could ridicule as they out-distanced their predecessors. Shall we be much mistaken, if we predict for them an existence even more brief than that of those who went before them? May we not even venture to express a belief, that, in part, they already belong to the past?

There will always be a class of men who will gladly listen to inspirations like those of the schools to which we have just referred. But, truth to say, in this matter it holds true, that "Times change and we with them." And here it may be well to remember that at previous periods, the apprehensions of some were great. Perhaps, not many of our readers remember the sensation (may we be allowed the term?) which the proposals of the Rationalists at first produced in Europe. We were at last to assist at the reconciliation of reason and revelation. Every difficulty was to be solved. With certain limitations, we were to be allowed to retain our old creeds and our old Bibles, without being disturbed by a single bold intruder, and yet we were to enjoy a feast of reason also! The out-and-out believers in the old system were denounced as weak or wicked. Many of them hid themselves abashed, and scarce ventured to raise a timid protest. Others, more bold in their profession, if not more calm in their attitude, dreaded that the last conflict had at last arrived, and that the approaching billows would well nigh overwhelm the church. But how different did the result prove, and how speedily did the danger—if ever it might rightly claim that name—pass away. Another period has now arrived. Again, have the enemies of the truth boasted of great things against the sling and stone, and again have some in the camp of Israel trembled at the appearance, the altitude, and the tone of the modern giant who defied them. We believe, and the result has in part already shown it, that there is no cause for apprehension. It is well known what excitement the works of Strauss, of Feuerbach, of Gfrörer, and of Bruno Bauer, produced on the Continent. Certain governments would have interdicted their publication or circulation; a large number of the laity, who were equally corrupted, morally and mentally, hailed the assertion of what they had long in secret cherished as the real explanation of the gospel. The philosophy—falsely so called—the criticism, the antiquarian researches with which the arguments of the "friends

of light," as they now called themselves, were supported, give an appearance of reality and learning to their cause, which gratified those who had pretences to learning, and deceived the illiterate. We well remember the excitement in the literary and social circles of Germany at the time! (our own college-term fell just about the close of that period.) Germany had long been ripening for it. A cold, heartless criticism had eaten at the kernel of the gospel, and the next generation threw away its shell also. Political life had been all but suppressed, and church and state were the two giants that kept to the ground the indignant nation. Together with an increasing moral laxity, the spirit of opposition also developed. Alas! that the church should ever have identified herself with politics or political parties. She had done so, and sad beyond expression were the consequences. The church had identified herself with the state. With mock gravity, she pronounced always her "Amen," and gave her bought blessing to what not only the Word of God, but even the feelings of men, denounced as infamous. The day of reckoning had now come. As generally before a revolution, it is the parasitical minister of state who falls first victim to rising popular indignation, so was it here. Everybody became a "friend of light." Critical niceties were now discussed in beer-gardens, instead of political rumours. The spirit of negation seized the mass, and for once, Protestant Germany threatened to become a scene of godless anarchy and wretched scepticism. Had it been so as the politicians of that day would have had it—had the perusal of Strauss' works been forbidden in Prussia, and the state attempted to force upon the people the straight-waistcoat of orthodoxy, the consequences would have been incalculable. Providentially it was otherwise. Neander's advice was taken, and everybody was allowed to read and write what he chose. Gradually the frenzy abated, and men began to inquire for themselves. It was discovered that after all Feuerbach's philosophy was very poor. We vividly remember the impression made on our minds when we discovered Feuerbach's mode of solving the question of "*sin*," and his off-hand proposal that in the future world, if such there were, one man's virtues should be reckoned substitutes for the corresponding vices of his friend. We also read Strauss, and that pen in hand. Somewhere amongst the MSS. belonging to our youthful period, are the notes of our doubts and difficulties, and our attempts at solution. But while we wondered at what seemed to us, sometimes, manifest literary dishonesty in proposing questions which had long been answered, and difficulties which only consisted in the mode of presenting certain subjects, Strauss and his friends seemed to us never really to have faced *the* question. The whole

basis of their system appeared to us a *petitio principii*, and the mode of argumentation only a clever attempt at supporting a groundless fabric. There was no earnestness about it all—it was a cavilling at difficulties, while the main point remained intact, or, as we have above expressed it, towered far aloft above all such attempts. *Gfrörer* we only read at a later period, and although we should at all times have been disgusted with his flippancy and egotism, it might probably have proved a more dangerous book to one who had not possessed sufficient historical material to perceive its fallacies.

From these writings we turned to those of Neander, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and Olshausen. What a different atmosphere did we now breathe! Specially shall we never lose the deep and indelible impression which NEANDER'S lectures produced upon our own mind and heart. We know that there are shallow critics who will decry him, as they will decry whatever their contracted minds cannot understand and their narrow souls cannot take in. We know that there were deficiencies, and serious deficiencies, about Neander. We have felt them, and we have mourned over them. But if ever man was useful in his generation—if scientifically and spiritually he was an instrument for good—it was the sainted father of modern church-history. He had apprehended the broad features of Christianity, and his deep soul reflected them, as did John's the image of his Master. He loved the Lord, and he followed after Him in godly sincerity and child-like simplicity. It was impossible merely to reverence Neander—you loved him. It was impossible merely to be instructed by Neander—you were moved to your inmost depths and edified by him. You loved the professor, you loved the Christian, you loved the man. His very peculiarities of manner, odd and sometimes repulsive in themselves as they were, became dear to us. Once again, to get rid of all cavillers, we do not accept of much of his criticism, we reject his neologian concessions, and did so from the first. "*Magis amica veritas*," say we, with reference to Neander also. But when we have made all these concessions, we feel that we can claim for Neander a place in history such as that which none has occupied since the days of the Reformers. We believe that the beneficial effects of his teaching on his students, on Germany, and on the Protestant world generally, were of the most beneficial character. The largest class-room in Berlin was always filled by an intelligent audience, which we have sometimes seen almost moved to tears under his simple and pathetic descriptions of the power of faith in Jesus. It were indeed impossible to determine whether Neander was greatest in the class-room or in the study.

But perhaps we have dwelt too long on the merely historical

part of our subject. We shall immediately endeavour to make up for our delay by introducing the reader to the works, the titles of which we have placed at the head of this article. But before doing so we are bound to explain to them why we have not referred to some other forms of antagonism to gospel-truth—more especially of those prevalent amongst ourselves—and why we have treated scepticism in a manner, which, to some, may perhaps appear as not sufficiently appreciating it. To the first inquiry we reply, that after all, British cavils at the text of the New Testament are but the puny offspring of attempts such as those of Strauss, and that the necessity of consulting our space—not to say the patience of our readers—has obliged us often only to indicate what might otherwise have been more fully carried out. To the second objection we rejoin, that to our minds scepticism does not seem to deserve a higher place than we have assigned to it. It is rather a mental and moral degeneracy—a defect, an abnormality within, than anything else. Scepticism cannot be met or overcome by arguments—it only gives place to a *sense* of the truth in its power. In this respect, it is like the weak and tender sapling, which bends before every wind, but is not readily rooted up. The storm will tear up the oak; it will not easily uproot the sapling. Argument will make impression on the sceptic, but it will not permanently convince him. Nothing short of the *power* of the truth can effectually remove his sign of interrogation. We are aware that great spiritual impulses have proceeded from a certain class of sceptics; not indeed the out-and-out sceptics, to whom all truth was matter of disbelief, or rather of unbelief, but from those who felt it impossible to receive some truths. We can, in part, understand why their influence had been ultimately for good in the world. On the one hand, the world could sympathize more with them, and by avoiding those errors in the church, to which it is (shall we say?) their mission to call attention, they could gain a more ready admission for that aspect of the truth which they present to the world. In another point of view, the church herself may be benefited by the bold, outspoken language which they hold. Their omissions may be made up, their mistakes may be corrected, and what of wholesome truth or earnest words of warning they bring us, ought not to be rejected because it is proffered in a manner not always agreeable, or carried by some beyond its proper bounds. Thoroughly as we dissent from many of those who are sometimes denounced rather more sweepingly than is consistent with Christian truth and charity, we have often felt that their hard words were almost necessary to bring us to a sense of our real state, of our requirements, if we are to influence mankind more generally, and of our peculiar defects and dangers.

We will not at present further prosecute this subject; but we have said enough to distinguish this class of—what shall we call them?—protesters or doubters, many of whom are earnestly seeking after spiritual truth, although often, amidst much mental and moral error, from the self-sufficient, superficial scoffers, whom our readers will not think we have too harshly characterized in our above remarks.

The attacks of the enemies of Christianity have at all times evoked champions for the truth; and, along with new defences against opponents, procured for the church fresh instruction and edification. Of course the line of argument followed at special times has necessarily been adapted to circumstances. We have had direct and indirect refutations of infidel writings, on scientific, historical, and critical grounds; the external and internal evidences for the truth of our religion have been brought out; the contradictions and untenableness of the systems of our opponents have been demonstrated; and, on the other hand, the beauty, harmony, consistency, and adaptation of the gospel displayed. We do not deny that at times direct argument on these subjects was, and even still is, necessary. To refute groundless assertions is sometimes almost as absolutely requisite as to exhibit truth. But, to our minds, these modes of pleading the cause of the gospel do not carry so much conviction as the more simple, but also more telling argument, wielded by an exhibition of Bible-truth. If we mistake not, it was Kant who somewhere clearly pointed out—what indeed almost amounts to a truism—that to refute your opponent is not necessarily to prove your own cause. It may be so, that *his* assertions are groundless, and yet *you* may be wrong. A mere *reductio ad absurdum* will not carry solid conviction. The latter, we believe, can only be produced by an exhibition of truth. Hence it is, that to our mind, the very beau ideal of a controversial treatise, is a work like Neander's "Life of Jesus," in which, in answer to Strauss, and with continual attention to his objections, the opposite truth is presented to the inquirer in a picture of the God-man, as traced in the gospels. Notwithstanding the many false concessions and doctrinal errors which that work contains, it will probably outlive all other replies to Strauss, and as it has greatly modified the views of that writer, so it may ultimately probably outlive the work to which it had originally been designed as a reply, just as the answer of Origen has outlived the attack of Celsus.

Side by side with the direct attacks upon Bible-truth and Bible-doctrine we have the more indirect, but to our mind, more dangerous opposition of those, who either by depressing the religion of Jesus to the level of others, or by attempting to elevate

the various systems of the ancient world to its level, have sought to shake our faith in Him as "the way, the truth, and the life." Similarities have been construed into identity, and instead of tracing certain affinities to a common origin, either of internal necessity on the part of all men, or of religious traditions which the heathen had in course of time corrupted and perverted, it is attempted to show that the religion of Jehovah is, after all, only a different form of the worship common to the heathen world. With an inconsistency, which, however, is too characteristic of these parties, it is denied that mankind had a common origin, while, at the same time, one of its strongest proofs in these affinities of worship is unduly developed.

The two works to which we have called the attention of our readers, are attempts to meet these two kinds of argument on the part of our opponents. The one undertakes to refute the assertions of Strauss and his followers; the other to compare the religion of the New Testament with the creeds of antiquity. In both cases, we have as yet only the first part of what are meant to be more extensive works. Mr. William Gillespie, the author of a work on the "Necessary Existence of God" has entered the lists against the "Prince of German Neologists," as he designates Strauss. It is not necessary here to detail the plan of Strauss's "Life of Jesus." Suffice it to say, that it attempts to prove from the discrepancies in the various Evangelists when compared with one another, and from alleged inconsistencies with other ascertained facts, that the Gospel narrative is not worthy of credit. The remarkable circumstance that so many witnesses should have recorded these things; that so many more should have believed and suffered for them; that Christianity sprung up, grew, and acted upon mankind as it did, is simply accounted for by the supposed existence of certain general expectations in the Jewish nation, to which the legends about Jesus adopted themselves, thus gaining an entrance and gradually spreading. Such, in a few words, is the system upon which Strauss first refutes, and then accounts for, the Gospel narrative. The reader will, on an impartial consideration of the general question, and without further entering on its merits, probably agree with us that it would take much more to believe the hypothesis of Strauss than the account of the Gospels. Indeed, a more unnatural or irrational mode of accounting for the origin of the Gospel could scarcely be conceived. However, while probably few persons would receive Strauss's theory as correct, some may have felt difficulties in consequence of his attempts to exhibit discrepancies, inconsistencies, and even impossibilities, in the various Gospel narratives. Mr. Gillespie proposes to account for these

discrepancies upon a theory peculiarly his own, at least in its systematic development. On all hands, it is of course, admitted that such discrepancies do exist. One Evangelist records what another wholly omits; or else he dwells on circumstances to which the others scarcely refer. These diversities in an historical narrative, where it is impossible to cross-question the witnesses so as to elicit their agreement on every point, whether recorded by all or not, are magnified or rather distorted by some into contradictions. It is scarcely requisite to show the fallacy of this line of argument. Suppose, that four pupils of Hegel or Strauss had written the life of their teacher, without consulting one another, at different times, under different circumstances, and for different readers, would there be no discrepancy in their narratives? Is it possible that four different minds can view the same events in exactly the same light? What attracts chiefly the attention of one, will it not shrink into comparative unimportance to another, whose mental constitution, present circumstances, or readers seem to call for a somewhat different treatment of the same subject? Should we in such a case say that Strauss or Hegel were pure myths? The case is even stronger, if instead of biographies of Strauss and Hegel, we suppose that four writers had attempted to describe the rise and meaning of the systems which are identified with the names of these two philosophers. Yet does this scarcely convey an adequate idea of the force of this argument when applied to the narrative of the life of the God-man, of His teaching and religion. It will readily be seen how differently it may be viewed by different minds, and how, indeed, such different presentations of the same truth, under different aspects, were absolutely requisite for the church and world. It would have been impossible in any way to present an adequate picture except by different writers and from different points of view. The colour *white* does not exist in nature; if you want to produce it, you must combine all the others.

We have dwelt on this one line of argument as prosecuted by Strauss, because in the part of his work before us, Mr. Gillespie only adverts to it. In "A Prologomenon for future Harmonizers," after the model of Kant's "Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik" (Prolegomena to every future Metaphysics), Mr. Gillespie repudiates the principle of former harmonizers, of dovetailing the various evangelical narratives into any harmonious whole. He would neither "deny" nor "soften the existence of any discrepancies;" he accounts for them by the different designs which each of the Evangelists had conceived, and which, from first to last, they keep steadily in view in their narratives.

If Luke or John mention certain events or circumstances which Matthew and Mark omit, or *vice versa*, this is satisfactorily accounted for, by the fact that Luke and John, Matthew and Mark, had each their separate object in writing, and adapted their narratives to it. In chapter second, Mr. Gillespie states and explains these designs, while the rest of the work is dedicated to an examination of the writings of each of the Evangelists, in order to prove that their design had been correctly apprehended. Before following Mr. Gillespie into these subjects, we cannot help even at this stage, expressing our dissent from his conclusions. We allow that there are discrepancies, although by no means so numerous as some would have them. But we do not believe that these discrepancies are solely or even primarily due to a difference in design. No doubt this forms an element in their explanation. But each Gospel is, we hold, not only designed for one class, but for every class. It may suit the one better than the other, but each Gospel suits all. Besides, we cannot see how the fact of a difference of design could influence one Evangelist in mentioning what the other had omitted. All of them wrote biographies of the Lord, and while we can understand that a difference of mental constitution might have led one to attach importance to a circumstance which another would judge to be only secondary (comparatively speaking) and hence perhaps omit, wholly or in part, we can scarcely believe that such omissions were *designed*. We shall illustrate this by a reference to the account of the Lord's agony in the garden. Of all the Evangelists Luke only relates (ch. xxii. 43) that an angel appeared to support the wrestling Saviour in that hour of bitterness. Passing over Strauss's inference from the circumstance of Luke's solitary testimony that "there is every presumption" against it, we have the equally startling announcement of Mr. Gillespie, that "if you consider what the Evangelists had in view, it will appear (*first*) that *Luke alone* could, consistently with his plan, relate such an event. *Matthew, Mark, John*, do not relate such an event; and none of them could, consistently with *his* plan, have done otherwise than omit such relation, however truly the event happened—however patent was his knowledge of the circumstance, and however much it lay within the sphere of each Evangelist's knowledge." (P. 126.) Now, we *cannot* believe that the Evangelists purposely omitted this or any other important circumstance. To charge any biographer with intentional omissions, for designs of his own—however laudable these designs might in themselves be—is to impugn his character for trustworthiness, and to diminish the value of his whole performance—it is to make him partial rather than truthful, a special pleader rather than an historian. In

truth, besides the arguments by which we have already controverted Mr. Gillespie's account of the discrepancies in the Evangelists, our readers will perceive how dangerous it would be to commit oneself to it. For, suppose that Mr. Gillespie's view were correct, the moment any one could prove that the design of the Evangelists was either different from that which he maintains, or that they wrote without any such set purposes by which to frame their narratives, the whole fabric would fall to the ground, and with acknowledged and now unaccounted discrepancies, we should stand before our adversaries "speechless." In our opinion, these discrepancies are necessary, and, historically, fully accounted for by the different mental constitution, training, circumstances, as well as the intended readers of the Evangelists.

But it is time to let Mr. Gillespie explain the various designs of the Gospel writers. "The great special object of Matthew is to prove . . . that Jesus is the Messiah promised to the Jews . . . Matthew's gospel is primarily for Jews." (P. 23.) "The chief special design of Mark is, to set forth and prove that Jesus was a divinely commissioned teacher . . . Mark's history was, therefore, primarily intended for the benefit of Gentile readers." (P. 24.) "Luke's great purpose has relation to the development of the humanity or human nature of that Jesus who, born of *Mary*, had, however, been conceived by the Holy Ghost (p. 25),—or as it is expressed in another passage—the development of the maternal humanity of our Lord." (P. 127.) "John has for his peculiar object, the exhibition of the nature, or personal character of the Divine Logos, together with his character and offices, being incarnate." (P. 28.) We will not, in the meantime, attempt to controvert any of these statements, and add that Mr. Gillespie seeks to establish them by a reference first to the "proëms or prologues," then to the contents of the various Gospels. Accordingly as Matthew wrote for Jews, and Mark for Gentiles, the former frequently, the latter never, quotes an Old Testament prophecy. The solitary case occurring in Mark xv. 28, is declared to be an interpolation, not on account of the evidence of MSS., versions, &c., which our author declares to be "in equilibrium;" but from the general analogy of Mark's never otherwise quoting from the Old Testament, which, as we are assured more forcibly than elegantly, "may be thrown as a make-weight into one scale whereby the other scale will be made to kick the beam. The make-weight, in addition, will make dead-weight on the whole." (P. 64.) Now whatever may be said of the passage in question—and we *rather* incline towards the opinion of its being interpolated—we must strongly object to this mode of argumenta-

tion; indeed, the more so, when we remember Mark's general appeal to the "prophets," (Mark i. 2.) Before passing we must be allowed to express a disappointment that Mr. Gillespie has not attempted a consistent explanation of the Old Testament quotations in Matthew. Such, we believe, would have been quite possible, and at any rate proved much more satisfactory than his sneers and witticisms at the expense of Germans and others who have adopted views different from his own.

The Gospel of Mark being chiefly destined for heathens, contains a more full and circumstantial account of the miracles performed by the Lord. And here our author, by the way, enters into a rather curious disquisition on the subject of witchcraft, in the existence of which, at the present day, he evidently believes. In opposition to Bishop Russel's opinion, who, "*sceptically repudiating the notion of the truth of all magic, good or bad,—as became in his shrewd opinion, a right reverend*" (p. 96), and a "*living Cambridge divine,*" who in the second volume of "*Kitto's Cyclopædia*" (article Witchcraft) "*invariably gets at the non-reality, and even the non-possibility, of all witchcraft, modern and ancient, as far as scripture (not in King James' translation but) in the original languages is concerned,*" Mr. Gillespie considers that "*nathless if the Bishop's facts be true facts (with reference to modern Egyptian jugglery) . . . the explainer of all the "exploits" and "feats" must needs be a signally skilful explorer . . . if indeed he be not just a wondrous adept in—"ingenious legerdemain."*" (P. 97.)

But we must not detain our readers. We shall only add one or two other objections. We cannot understand why Mr. Gillespie so stoutly denies, on the ground of a proposed new translation of Luke i. 1 (rendering "accomplished" instead of "believed" amongst us), that Luke was of Gentile extraction, without ever condescending to notice the decisive passage Col. iv. 10, 11, compared with v. 14. Nor can we agree to a system of interpretation which ignores the manifest influence of Peter upon Mark, and of Paul upon Luke. We conclude by taking exception to the style of our author, which is of a somewhat odd and satirical character, and to an arrangement which makes a great part of the book to consist of notes, and adds notes upon notes until it is, sometimes, really difficult to find one's way in it.

If the reader have thought us rather severe, we hasten to add that one ground of our exercising so much of strict critical justice (and we trust it has only been justice) has been the indiscriminate and ill-judged attacks in which our author indulges upon all who differ from him. Let the reader decide from the following quotations whether they are appropriate or add to the value of his argument:—

"But this is—German criticism; of the true modern complexion too; what we may call *criticism with a vengeance*."—P. 32.

"Heaven preserve us from a too close embrace—a kiss! of certain friends, on all occasions. Was Judas Iscariot cursed, not to commit suicide, but to be the undying Wandering Jew? And does the wandering Jew sometimes wander no farther than into the study-room of one of your German critics on (*Anglicè*, against) the Bible, which room is the Wandering Jew's own?"—P. 54.

"I shall leave my reader to come to his own conclusion . . . between the more modest affirmation of the native and the very positive denial of the foreigner."—P. 56.

"As, in like manner, Hengstenberg charges another evangelist with a certain *failure of pen* . . . *Et tu, Brute!* . . . And, indeed, almost everything shows, if we will but believe these Germans, how inferior in memory and every mental power (to say nothing of the physical use of the pen) were all the Evangelists . . . to your Schleiermachers and Olshausens, not to mention your Dr. Wettes and Strausses."—P. 65.

Sometimes our author addresses his German friends sarcastically as "Prithee, Olshausen." We might quote passages such as these from almost every other page. However, it is a comfort to know that Mr. Gillespie is not only a "German-eater" (as Heine called the historian Menzel a "Franzosen-Fresser," a devourer of the French): English and American writers come in for their full share of criticism, couched not in the most flattering terms. Having said so much against Mr. Gillespie's book, we will, however, add, that it contains some excellent passages (as pp. 128, &c.), and displays considerable originality and talent, and still more considerable learning. If Mr. Gillespie would only consent to write in a natural style, and to omit all offensive personalities, his treatises might become a very valuable addition to our theological literature.

We have not left ourselves space for an extended critique of Mr. Hardwick's "Christ and other Masters;" nor is it hardly requisite, as, even more than Mr. Gillespie's treatise, it is only introductory. The difference in style and in spirit between these two writers is equally great. If Mr. Gillespie is curt and cramped, and to our mind, often inelegant, Mr. Hardwick is diffuse, and sometimes a little too flowery and oratorical. If Mr. Gillespie condemns everybody who does not out-and-out agree with him, Mr. Hardwick's liberality is sometimes too great—at any rate, beyond our own boundary-line. At the close of the first or introductory chapter "on the religious tendencies of the present age," Mr. Hardwick details his general plan, which is to exhibit the characteristic features of Bible religion by a minute comparison with the religions "of Hindostan and the adjoining countries" (in Part II.); with those "of Mexico, of China, and the Southern

Seas" (in Part III.); with those "of ancient Egypt and Persia" (in Part IV.); with those "of ancient Greece and Rome" (in Part V.); and with those "of the Saxon, Scandinavian, and Slavonic tribes," (in Part VI.). The reader will agree that this plan is very comprehensive; that the subjects are equally new, important, and interesting; and that the promises held out to us by Mr. Hardwick are of a sufficiently engaging character. We shall add that from the extensive learning displayed in the part before us, we infer that our author is fully qualified for his task, and we expect that his forthcoming treatises will be held as a boon by the theological world. However, it would not be proper to close this notice without saying that we sometimes could have desiderated more originality and greater depth in our author. To his introductory chapter he has added two others—in fact, dissertations—on the "Unity of the Human Race," and on the "Characteristics of Religion under the Old Testament." It is specially to parts of the latter that we object. Mr. Hardwick does not seem to us to have fully appreciated either the old economy or its connexion with the new. This becomes most distinctly apparent in his remarks on the temple ritual. We will not at present develop our own views on this subject, but we cannot agree to Mr. Hardwick's "accommodation theory," by which "Jehovah rescued the Hebrew from the seduction of heathen worship by providing forms adapted to his temperament and his capacity, yet making all such forms the vehicles of pure ideas and noble aspirations." (P. 102.) God cannot accommodate his claims to man's tendency after heathenism, and the Old Testament ritual must be viewed in a different light. It has been customary to distinguish in it the *symbol* from the *type*. The former conveyed instruction for the present, the latter indicated future events. Thus, the Lord's Supper is a symbol—while the destruction of Jerusalem was a type. To the celebrated Bähr (in his "Symbolik,") belongs the honour of having first clearly pointed and consistently carried out these distinctions. According to this divine, the symbol is always the basis of the type, and the symbolical meaning must first be ascertained, and serve as an index to the typical. Mr. Hardwick not only adopts this view but seems to hold that even the very choicest of the Old Testament worthies only "obtained some passing glimpses of the evangelic promise," while "others, when they worshipped either in the wilderness or on the sacred hill of Sion, may have gathered from the multiplicity of public sacrifices no acquaintance with the holy Victim of the Cross." (Pp. 104. 105.) And yet he holds that "their devotion was accepted and rewarded." Now, believing as we do, that under the Old as under the New Testament there was only *one* way of acceptance, and that not of

ignorant and unruly ceremonial devotion, but of faith in the promised and typified, or in the risen Saviour, we cannot agree to either the one or the other of Mr. Hardwick's assertions. Indeed, we have strong doubts even as to Bähr's principle of the symbolical, being the basis of the typical. Considering what these symbols were, and what all doctrine would be without Christ, we cannot well conceive in the Old Testament economy symbols without types, and would rather hold that the types were the foundation of the symbols than the opposite.

However, it must at present suffice us to have indicated these things. We have said enough to interest our readers in the two volumes to which we have called their attention. We believe they will be read; and, indeed, they deserve to be extensively and attentively perused.

ART. III.—*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.* By William Lindsay Alexander, D.D. 8vo. Pp. 519. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1856.

IN the chapter of church history which relates to the northern part of our island, instruction and interest are so rife as in few others. The glowing intellect and practical energy of the people would naturally lead men to expect some markworthy manifestation when that fiery spirit should be won by, and blent with the diviner flame. It was, moreover, a question of great consequence for the modern European nations, and for the world, how that nation which had so marked an individuality, and was most nearly allied to the leading one, would bear herself when Christianized. Since the history of the religion of a country is, to say the least, inextricably interwoven with the lives of its most prominent saints, he who turns an eye of serious curiosity to the unfolding of Scottish religion will carefully regard the figures which appear most active at its great moments. Such an eye, at whatever distance, will, it may be fearlessly predicted, linger long and lovingly on the present volume.

Scottish Congregational Dissent was not the offspring of a mere theory, based either on speculation or criticism, but, like the polity of the New Testament, was necessitated by the new and vigorous vitality of which it appeared as the appropriate embodiment and the apt organ. The "orthodox, orthodox, who believed in John Knox," had long lost their original power, and from many of their pulpits was proclaimed "a different

gospel;" while where the genuine gospel was preached, it was often in such a way as greatly to prevent its proper effect.

"After the excitement of the Rebellion of 1745 had passed away, a period of national torpor ensued. The nation was in fact in a chrysalis state, undergoing one of those great social transformations, which mark the stages by which peoples advance to maturity. Everything was more or less affected by a spirit of repose. Political enthusiasm or activity there was none. Commercial enterprize was only beginning to look languidly around for openings through which it might exert the strength it was as yet carefully husbanding. Literature showed most life; but it was of a quiet and graceful kind, eminently conservative of the proprieties, and afraid to trust its wings beyond the sound of the critic's whistle. In this general stillness and torpor religion shared; indeed one might almost say that hers was the deepest slumber of all. In the national church, the long reign of moderatism had done much to extrude all vital godliness, and to reduce the Christianity of both pastors and people to the lowest possible degree of attenuation compatible with the retention of the name. The majority of the ministers were avowedly Arminian, if not Pelagian, in their doctrinal views; not a few of them were Crypto-Socinians; and it was even insinuated that some, holding no mean place in the church, were more than imbued with the scepticism of Hume. A few noble spirits still held aloft the banner of evangelical orthodoxy, and stood valiantly by it; but they formed so slender a proportion of the whole, that their efforts could do comparatively little towards counteracting the unwholesome influence of the majority. In the dissenting churches, the state of things was undoubtedly greatly better; for in them no toleration was given to unsound doctrine, and the tone of religious feeling and sentiment was much higher than in the establishment. Still there was but little of energetic piety even among them; little of aggressive activity in the propagation of the gospel; little of what Shaftesbury derisively and yet most truly called 'the heroic passion of saving souls;' and along with this there was much too prevalent a disposition to set the mere apparatus of ecclesiastical order above the great ends for which such is alone valuable."—Pp. 43, 44.

The young Wardlaw writes thus to his father in 1801:—

"In this place [Perth?] there is no doubt much room for more of the gospel, not from the want of it and abundance of error, but chiefly from the way in which it is administered. The clergy here are indolent in the extreme. They have a practice of exchanging pulpits, every man going his round. One text, by means of subdivisions and recapitulations, lasts them in this way six or eight rounds. And as by the time they get through it, it may be supposed the people must have forgot the beginning, they can then set to the same again, or if this be too much, they take one which is not much older. And thus two or three lectures and sermons serve them for years, to 'ring round the same unvaried chimes.' There is a weekly

sermon on Thursday to which the people are sometimes assembled by the bell, and find the doors shut, while he who should have preached has been found sauntering about the fields. This indolence is more remarkable in one than in the rest. But their texts and peculiar phrases, both in prayer and in preaching, are used as byewords among the people, some of whom express the disgust which many more feel."
—P. 54.

Again :—

"In the forenoon I went to Dr. B. He preached from these words 'Oh, give thanks to the Lord, for He is good.' He began: 'All that I intend from these words is, *first*, to prove the proposition that God is good; and, *secondly*, to point out the effects which the consideration of this should have on our temper and conduct. Two arguments have been employed by writers on the first of these points; the one more abstract, drawn from the nature and perfections of the Deity; the other more familiar, deduced from the consideration of his works.' As the former would have led him into deep philosophical speculation, he confined himself to the latter, on which he, *of course*, took a very common-place survey of the whole creation from the universe down to our world, and from our world at large down to the blades of grass and the insects that dance in the sunbeam. He dwelt on the dignity and happiness of man who is made 'wiser than the fowls of heaven, and with more understanding than the beasts of the field,' &c., &c. The inference he drew from all this fine description was a very plain falsehood—'that the world *as we now see it*, including man, is exactly such as we should *à priori* have expected to proceed from an infinitely benevolent Being!' A man might have sat and followed every sentence with a parody proving the directly contrary; for there was not a word about the effects of sin in poisoning the sources of happiness. The world *as it is* was just as it *should be*—a very nice world. He stated our national blessings, and touched on the specialities of the day. He could not well omit among the blessings which proved God to be good, the redemption by Christ. Having heard that he once preached the gospel, I wished particularly to hear his creed on this subject. It was in substance, and nearly in his own words, as follows: 'It is our duty to serve God our Creator and to keep his commandments, and we cannot reasonably expect happiness but in so doing. As I have shown that God is a Being of infinite compassion, He will pay a due regard to, and make all allowance for our frailty; and though our virtue be imperfect, it will certainly be accepted through the all-prevalent mediation and intercession of Jesus Christ, and we shall be admitted into his kingdom which he has prepared for all the good and worthy among mankind.' From the first part of the discourse he inferred under the second the common duties of gratitude, praise, liberality, &c. The whole discourse, which he read, was *uncommonly common*, and we were not an hour altogether in church. The improvement which I made of the sermon—for I think my attendance was not without profit—I shall leave you to guess at, and to suggest also what you think I *should* have learned from it. I can

only assure you I heard with regret and vexation rather than with critical censoriousness."—P. 61.

"The good men, says Dr. Alexander, who instituted the congregational system in Scotland, felt a need for a higher kind of spiritual nourishment than they had been accustomed to, and for more of warmth and heartiness in the proclamation of religious truth to men than the fashion of pulpit address at that time permitted. They mourned over the want of Christian fellowship, sympathy, and co-operation in the churches, all of which had come to wither under the blight of a stiff and jealous officialism. And they sorrowed most of all for the multitudes who were living around them in ignorance and in sin, misled by unsound teaching, or left to perish without teaching of any kind. Could they have found the remedy of these evils, and the securing of the desiderated benefits, in religious societies with which they were already connected, it was not in their minds to have ever forsaken these. On the contrary, they rather clung to them with filial affection; nor was it until they were treated as unworthy and rebellious children—their requests refused, their longing desires scorned, their evangelistic efforts repressed and punished, and the whole machinery of ecclesiastical despotism put in operation to repress or terrify them, that they asserted their rights as men whom the truth had made free, and availed themselves of the liberty conceded to them by the laws of their country, to unfurl the banner of an independent communion, unfettered either by state control or ecclesiastical domination."—P. 39.

To this new polity the subject of this memoir was early won over, became a prominent associate of its originators, and having identified himself with its growth at every stage of his own manhood, left when he departed his deep and permanent impress thereon. To this fact, and also to his individual influence, reaching far beyond the Tweed, is due the significance of his name.

Ralph Wardlaw was born at Dalkeith, in 1779. His father afterwards became a merchant and *bailie* of Glasgow. On the mother's side he was the great grandson of the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, of Secession notoriety, beyond whom there appears genealogical lustre of a very different kind, namely, of the Mar family, James V. of Scotland (Wardlaw a scion of the Stewarts!) and, further still, some Scandinavian figures at once magnified and obscured by heroic mist. It is an interesting fact, that, though young Wardlaw was unconscious of any sudden conversion, his Christian character was the growth of home influences, and particularly of morning readings of the Greek Testament with his father. "The son acted the part of reader and the father of expositor," as the latter was dressing. After four years at the grammar school of Glasgow, Ralph entered at the early age of twelve the university of the same city, where he remained for six sessions. Richardson was then Professor of

Humanity; Young, of Greek; Jardine, of Logic; Arthur, of Ethics; Meikleham, of Physics. During two sessions, Wardlaw attended the lectures of the Divinity Professor as a voluntary student. Thomas Campbell the poet, was among the students. Wardlaw was active at a debating club, called, "The Philosophical Society." Hitherto he had inclined to medicine, but now he gave himself to the ministry of the gospel, took the communion at Dr. Kidstone's church, and entered on the study of theology under Dr. George Lawson, at the hall of the burgher synod, Selkirk. Here the method of teaching was admirably stimulating,—much resembling that of Dr. Pye Smith. Here Wardlaw continued for five years. In these preliminary studies he attained considerably proficiency in classics, logic and psychology, acquired a taste for botany and anatomy, but had not shown any particular aptness for mathematics. It is probable that he profited greatly in Biblical criticism and theology under Lawson, "whose familiarity with the Hebrew and Greek texts was such as to give rise to the tradition among his students, that he could repeat the entire Bible in the original, and whose reading in theology was extensive, and who had so meditated upon all that he had read, that his mind was full of theological truth, and he had only to unlock his mental repositories to pour out upon his hearers a copious supply of sound and rich thought upon every branch of this subject." It appears to have been Dr. Wardlaw's habit through life to begin the day by a perusal of a portion of the Hebrew Bible or Greek Testament, so that his knowledge of Hebrew must have been respectable.

At the conclusion of his preparatory course, Mr. Wardlaw, who had long been an interested observer of the congregational movement, declared himself an independent. When Lawson was told of this, he said, "Well, it doesn't much matter: Ralph Wardlaw will make a good anything." "Have you heard," said a gentleman at a party one night, "that young Mr. Wardlaw, Bailie Wardlaw's son, is already on the brink of Socinianism?" "You needn't be afraid," said the excellent Dr. Balfour who was present; "I by no means approve of what Mr. Wardlaw has done; but I know him well, and I think I may pledge my word that he will not go far wrong either in doctrine or in life." "This young man," Andrew Fuller records in his diary, "is a promising character."

Academic rust hindered for a time Mr. Wardlaw's acceptance as a preacher. But this was soon rubbed off. He now diligently journeyed through various parts of Scotland, to feed hungry souls with the bread of life; showing not only zeal, but a very high degree of bodily activity and strength. Having

preached a while at Perth, it was proposed that he should settle there, for the purpose of forming a new congregation and church. This, however, he saw fit to decline. About the same time, it was proposed by his father and his other relatives and friends in Glasgow, to build there at their own expense a church for his use. This was carried into effect. The new place was opened in February, 1803. On this occasion sixty-one members, amicably seceding from the church of the Rev. Greville Ewing, at the Tabernacle, between whom and Mr. Wardlaw there was now and ever after a cordial friendship and co-operation, were formally constituted as a separate society, and Mr. Wardlaw ordained as their pastor.

The church and congregation increased slowly but surely. Mr. Wardlaw attached great importance to purity of communion, regarding it as not only right in principle, but indispensable for the peace of a congregational church, as it was for those planted by the apostles. Although such a creed must have somewhat hindered that rapid external enlargement so greatly estimated by some, yet "from these principles he never swerved during the whole course of his ministry. On the contrary, he to the last regarded purity of communion as one of the great fundamental principles of apostolic church order, without attention to which no church could really prosper; and one of the principal services which he considered the congregational churches to have rendered to the cause of Christ in Scotland was their having recalled this principle into prominent notice from that oblivion and neglect under which it had been allowed to fall." (P. 73.) The youthful pastor laboured and grew calmly and healthily for several years. Stirring incidents do not commonly occur in the career of the minister and student. Yet although the combination of the contemplative and the active life is perhaps rarer now than formerly, and although the record of such a course as Wardlaw's is necessarily to a great extent one of preachments, speeches, and publications, he was called, as will appear presently, to have more to do with great public religious and humane movements than most of his brethren. In 1805 or 1806, he joined "The Glasgow Literary and Commercial Society," of which he continued an active member for many years, reading papers, and for a considerable part of the time, filling the office of secretary. When he resigned this in 1816, he received a testimonial from the members, expressive of their respect and gratitude, for the manner in which he had discharged its duties. After a time, disputes began to rise among individuals and churches of the congregational denomination about the basis, nature and limits of the pastoral office. Heart-burnings and disruption were the consequence. But the

prudence and good temper of Mr. Wardlaw succeeded in preventing the "root of bitterness" from attaining, in his own church, more than an insignificant growth. Once it seemed likely, that, for the above and other reasons, in conjunction with the restlessness of certain indiscreet spirits in Wardlaw's church, communion would be interrupted between the two kindred churches of Ewing and Wardlaw; but this fear was dispelled by the clear and firm enunciation by the latter to his church of the principles of intercommunion. Mr. Wardlaw continued to grow in intellectual vigour, in influence, and in usefulness. He was always among the foremost promoters of the Scottish Congregational Union, aiding it by his counsels, and often preaching for the increase of its funds. Besides work more strictly ministerial, he undertook, in conjunction with Mr. Ewing, the office of theological tutor in the Glasgow Academy, which he held, either jointly or solely, till death. These Glasgow relations he would never dissolve, though he was often invited to other and more tempting theological chairs; to Hoxton in 1817, to Rotherham twice, in 1828 and 1833, to Spring Hill in 1837, and in 1842 to the Lancashire College. Nor did he give any encouragement when sounded in 1828 about an invitation to the chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of London. These invitations were, of course, results and marks of his reputation as a man of the best kind of influence in his own sphere, and especially as a theologian. To see a man for a large number of years steadily resisting so many considerable and various allurements, and enduringly shedding his "burning and shining light," beneficently in the spot where it was first kindled, partakes of the moral sublime. His well-known "Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy," appeared in 1814, and his reply to Yates, the Unitarian minister, who had answered the above, in 1816, under the title, "Unitarianism Incapable of Vindication." In 1818, he received from Yale College, the diploma of D.D., which suggests a new application of Dr. Johnson's remark on a similar occasion, to the effect that "such distinctions would be more valuable were they always conferred with equal judgment." He had already in May of that year, passed the ordeal of preaching before the London Missionary Society, at Surrey Chapel. The real venerableness of the audience on that occasion needs not the exaggerating expression employed by Dr. Alexander, "the *élite* of the religious world in Europe," though the rest of the description is characteristic enough. (P. 183.) The original chapel at Glasgow having now for some time been too small for the congregation, a new and handsome building was erected on an eligible site, and with accommodation for 1,600 hearers, and

opened in 1819. Dr. Wardlaw was now often appearing before the public as an author. In 1824, appeared "A Dissertation on the Scriptural Authority, Nature, and Uses of Infant Baptism." A subsequent edition of this work afterwards drew him into controversy with Dr. Halley. In 1825, Mr. Brougham had uttered a sentiment in his inaugural address as Lord Rector of the Glasgow University, which seemed to Dr. Wardlaw to involve serious and dangerous error, and to demand elaborate refutation. Accordingly he soon after delivered and published, "Man Responsible for his Belief: Two Sermons—occasioned by a Passage," &c. In 1829, he published a valuable volume of sermons, wherein he ably deals, besides other subjects, with the Millenarian controversy. In 1830, appeared "Two Essays: I. On the Assurance of Faith. II. On the Extent of the Atonement and Universal Pardon," in opposition to the doctrine of Erskine, since advocated by the fascinating pen of Mr. Maurice. In 1833, he delivered in London the first* series of Congregational Lectures, which were afterwards published with the somewhat incorrect title of "Christian Ethics, or Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation." Perhaps the most important service ever rendered by Dr. Wardlaw to the kingdom of Christ, was by delivering in London in 1839, and afterwards publishing, "National Church Establishments Examined,—in a course of Lectures." These were in reply to Dr. Chalmers, who had recently lectured on the other side.

"It was in many respects a very different audience from that which had gathered round Dr. Chalmers. There were no princes of the blood present, no peers of the realm, no prelates or high ecclesiastical dignitaries. But there were masses of the earnest, thoughtful, practical, middle class,—that class which forms the backbone of English society, and by which all that affects the political interests of the country is, in the main, ultimately determined. Several members of the House of Commons attended the course from its commencement to its close; nor were there wanting many whose earnest look and high intellectual bearing, bespoke the descendants of the men to whom no partial judge has assigned the honour of having 'with the zeal of martyrs, the purity of the early Christians, the skill and the courage of the most renowned warriors, gloriously suffered and fought, and conquered for England the free constitution she now enjoys.'† Before such an audience, Dr.

* At the end of Dr. Wardlaw's preface is the following sentence: "It is right for me, however, to state, that I owe my appointment for the *first* series to the circumstance of my learned and excellent friend, the Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, having found it necessary, from special engagements, to decline the acceptance of it. Many will regret this besides myself."

† Brougham's Speeches, vol. ii. p. 53.

Wardlaw might well feel some anxiety in appearing; but nothing could be more cordial than the reception he met with, and nothing more enthusiastic than the plaudits with which he was continually cheered as he advanced. In the estimation of all who heard him, he discharged nobly the duty which had been imposed upon him, and more than equalled all the high expectations that had been formed of him from former efforts."—Pp. 380, 381.

In 1841, he published "Letters to the Reverend Hugh M'Neile, M.A., on some portions of his lectures on the Church of England."

The lectures of Mr. M'Neile were delivered in London in the course of the preceding year, and were designed partly to supply some points omitted by Dr. Chalmers, especially bearing on the pretensions of the Anglican Church, and partly to reply to some of the reasonings of Dr. Wardlaw in his lectures on Church Establishments. . . . In one respect it was hardly worth Dr. Wardlaw's while to spend much time in replying to such a work as Mr. M'Neile had sent forth; but in another respect it was of importance that it should be noticed, for an opportunity was afforded by its appearance of still further indoctrinating the public mind with just principles on the important topics on which the lecturer had touched. . . . In these letters the author's wonted acuteness, discrimination, and sagacity are remarkably displayed; whilst there is the most careful avoidance of every thing in expression and allusion that could appear inconsistent with respect and even esteem for the person of his opponent." Pp. 401, 2, 3.

In 1842, Dr. Wardlaw delivered in Glasgow, at the request of his fellow-citizens, a course of lectures on "Female Prostitution: its Nature, Extent, Effects, Guilt, Causes, and Remedy, &c." These were soon after re-delivered in Edinburgh, and then published. "The judgment of the virtuous public generally on this work," says Dr. Alexander, "may be furnished by the following extract from a review of it in the *Christian Guardian*: 'We can employ no language sufficiently strong to express our admiration of the manner in which the author has executed his delicate task.' The same critic commends this volume as the most masterly production on this very melancholy theme in our own or in any language."

A complete list of those who have been charged with *unsoundness* would be a curiosity. It may surprise some to hear that such a list would include the name of Wardlaw, and still more that the alleged "unsoundness" respected the doctrine of *atonement*. To defend himself against this malicious charge, Dr. Wardlaw delivered a course of lectures on the subject, which were published in 1843, as "Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ." Dr. Alexander says of the preface to the second edition of this work, "Reviewers

Reviewed," that Dr. Wardlaw "never displayed greater power in any of his writings than he has shown in this preface; which, viewed merely as a piece of dialectic and polemic writing, it is worth the while of all learners to study as an exercise, and of all proficient to read as a treat." In 1848, Dr. Wardlaw published "Congregational Independency, in contradistinction to Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, the Church Polity of the New Testament." This work had been long expected, but appears neither to have fully satisfied the friends of independency, nor to have been greatly admired by Dr. Wardlaw's biographer.

Besides these, the facile pen of Dr. Wardlaw produced a numerous host of volumes, single sermons, pamphlets, magazine articles, and the like, of various degrees of merit. He was one of the most prolific, as well as popular and useful theological writers of his age.

The part which he took in the memorable, and in some respects, sad Apocrypha-controversy between the Bible Society and many of its supporters, was in every way worthy of that remarkable combination of firmness and gentleness by which he was characterized.

Having wept with the slave during the period of his oppression, and having with great self-sacrifice, in such a place as Glasgow, advocated his cause, he rejoiced with him on the 1st of August, 1834.

In 1840, he acted as one of the adjudicators of the prize offered for the best essay on Christian Missions.

The fruit of his marriage with Miss Smith, of Dunfermline, in 1803, had been eleven children in all; two of whom he lost in infancy, and nine grew to maturity; one of his sons becoming a missionary, and two daughters marrying missionaries; "and when he was taken from earth, he had the immense satisfaction of believing on solid grounds, that both those who had preceded him, and those whom he left behind, were bound up with him in the bundle of eternal life, and should be found standing with him 'in his lot at the end of the days.'"

From the case of Dr. Wardlaw, Christian ministers were to learn the stern lesson, that not the most perfect human purity and rectitude, combined with singular prudence, will always secure against the attacks of invidious and malicious calumny. If ever man was distinguished by a prudence which "avoided even the appearance of evil," or might have expected exemption from such annoyance, Dr. Wardlaw was he. Yet his latter days were to be thus embittered. If the account of the part taken in this affair by Dr. Wardlaw's colleague in the pastorate, which is given by Dr. Alexander, is to be taken as trustworthy, which it doubtless is, that conduct richly deserves the epithet "dis-

gusting" which he employs. But such absurd attacks will always in the end injure their silly authors and abettors rather than their objects. Dr. Wardlaw's character acquired even in old age a new tone from this cruel discipline, and shone with fresh radiance before his brethren. Soon after his triumphant vindication, he visited London to preach one of the sermons before the London Missionary Society. "His reception by the brethren in the south was of the most enthusiastic and gratifying description." Even his physical energy and animal spirits seems to have improved after the trial.

The 16th of February, 1853, completed the fiftieth year at once of the church and of his pastorate. The moment of so remarkable a coincidence deserved an extraordinary celebration, —a twofold jubilee. A series of meetings was held, at which were present many of the most prominent ministers of the denomination in Scotland, as well as Mr. Binney and Dr. Harris from the south. A large sum of money was raised to erect a monumental building, "THE WARDLAW JUBILEE SCHOOL AND MISSION HOUSE."

The time of Wardlaw's departure was now drawing nigh. He had for many years been affected more or less by an obscure, but very distressing species of neuralgia. The pain was capable of alleviation by medicine, but nothing could reach the disease.

"So deep was the interest he continued to take in the work to which he had consecrated his life, that it was with difficulty he could be persuaded to take that ease which his state of health rendered necessary. He persisted in attending public worship on the Lord's day; and only three weeks before his death he presided at the Lord's Supper, and conducted the service. It was a solemn and memorable scene. 'His frame,' says an eye-witness, 'was bent, his step unsteady, and his features wan and shrunk. As he looked round upon the church, seated at the Lord's table, he appeared like a wearied man at the close of a long day's work. Those who have never seen the Doctor at the communion-table, can have no conception of the solemnity he threw over that hallowed scene. That afternoon, few will forget, as in an audible whisper he spoke of the love of Christ—his sufferings, and the glory to be revealed. It was the parting scene with a church that loved him second only to the Chief Shepherd. And in no more appropriate way could an aged pastor bid adieu to his people. 'I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.' After singing a hymn, he pronounced the benediction, and then his work there was done."* After that day his face was

* Recollections of Dr. Wardlaw, in the *Young Men's Magazine* for February, 1854.

no more seen, his voice never again heard in that place where it had for so many years been his delight, to a delighted and attached audience, to expound the truths of the gospel. He was only able to perform one other act of official duty. On the Thursday following he met the students of the Academy, and read to them two lectures in course on the Wisdom of God. It was with difficulty he got through this duty. His sight frequently failed him as he proceeded, and again and again he took off his spectacles and wiped them, as if the impediment arose from them, not witting that the shadows of eternity were beginning to stretch themselves over him. When his lecture was finished, he said, 'Gentlemen, next Thursday we shall go on to consider the Wisdom of God in Redemption.' That purpose he was not permitted to accomplish. It was the will of the master that he should go up and contemplate that grand theme amid the perfect light of the heavenly world, and under the immediate teaching of the Author of redemption Himself.

"After this his sufferings became very severe. His agony oftentimes was such that tears rolled down his cheeks, and he shrank from subjecting his friends to the pain of seeing what he endured. But amid all he was calm and self-possessed, and his faith failed not. His soul was centred on the cross as the basis of his hopes, and his lively expectations ascended to the throne as the consummation of his joys. When death overtook him, and the powers of nature were fast giving way, the words that were murmured over those eloquent lips on which hundreds had delighted to hang, were such as these: 'The Lamb—the Lamb slain for me—the Lamb in the midst of the throne—what a glorious prospect! I shall see and be with the Lamb.' And so he died, strong in faith and love, and with no shadow on his bright and happy spirit.

"Dr. Wardlaw died within a few days of completing his seventy-fourth year."—Pp. 471–4.

Dr. Wardlaw was of middle height, and vigorous and active frame; the forehead high, though not very broad, the features regular, eyebrows bushy, lips sweet but firm, and the general expression, dignity and seriousness combined with cheerfulness and benevolence. His intellect excelled rather in analysis than in finding matter to be analyzed, was capable of prompt, vigorous, and long action, and was ever controlled and kept diligently at work by a will swayed by conscience. He delighted in the nice weighing of evidence. He possessed a naturally elegant and a cultivated taste. Dugald Stewart was his philosopher; Cowper his poet. He occasionally wrote poetry, which was sometimes inspired by natural scenery, and pleasingly unaffected and simple, sometimes sacred, sometimes satirical. This weapon he could wield on occasion with effect, never with malice, and always on the right side. He was ready at repartee.

"In 1838, he, with several other dissenting ministers, had the honour of being presented to her Majesty, and of kissing hands. . . .

Dr. Wardlaw, though not accustomed to wear a gown as a badge of clerical dignity, conformed to usage on this occasion, and went to court in the costume of a doctor in divinity, with gown and bands. Another dissenting minister, who was present for some other business, but whose conscience would not allow him to appear in any other dress than that which court usage allots to laymen, came up to Dr. Wardlaw in the ante-chamber and said, 'I am surprised to see *you*, Dr. Wardlaw, conform in this way to the Church;' to which the latter immediately replied, pointing to the sword and bag-wig, "And *you*, Mr. —, I am grieved to see so conformed to the world"—P. 373.

Yet was he gentle and kind, even tender. He possessed an exquisite power of comforting mourners, and could reduce the tears of nature to the lowest possible ebb. But at the proper moment he could show high moral courage. When the Anti-slavery movement was exceedingly unpopular in Glasgow, he spoke thus at one of the meetings:—

"If I had yielded to the influence of friendship I should not have appeared here this day; and I know the cost of my attendance in the coldness, distance, and alienation which I shall experience from some whose friendship I prize. But I felt the call of duty to be higher than that of friendship, and I dare not keep back. There are two things of higher importance than the pleasures of earthly friendship—an approving conscience and an approving God."—P. 299.

And when indignation was roused by unworthiness, he could utter burning words as with the tongue of a fiery serpent. Thus in reply to Anglo-Scotus (see page 338), he says:—

"Regarding Anglo-Scotus solely as he has been pleased to give us a glimpse of himself in this production, I have no hesitation in saying, respect is not his due; courtesy is not his due; charity is not his due; Mercy, in the plenitude of her kindness, may bestow on him gratuitous pity; but what Justice awards him is scorn. I know of no terms in which the treatment merited by an anonymous scandal-monger can be more appropriately expressed than those of Job: 'Men shall clap their hands at him, and shall hiss him out of his place.'"—P. 339.

Few men have known so well as Wardlaw the meaning of the word *home*. His fireside was his daily charm and source of strength. He enlarges one's conceptions of husband and father. He was a man of order. The room and fireplace must be tidy when he began to write. Yet as he well knew that a mechanical man can never produce a vital impression, his general habits were orderly rather from an inward principle than in obedience to a set of rules. A man is known by his friendships. In former years you see Dr. Wardlaw the guest of the lively

Gunn, then of the amiable Durant. Here, he appears as colleague of the venerable Ewing, there, spite of the Apocrypha controversy, faithful to his loving Heugh; accompanying with metaphysical Payne and elegant Fletcher, and corresponding through long years with the practical Burder. You observe him exchanging letters with an unseen brother theologian, Woods of Andover—the transatlantic Wardlaw—and again are delighted with the loving reverence of Morison, whose timid worth he had encouraged into the ministry. Nor must there be omitted his later colleague in the Academy—much his junior—the loveable, accomplished, but, alas! early removed, John Morell Mackenzie. As a preacher Dr. Wardlaw attained a high degree of excellence, of a kind particularly suited to his countrymen. He stood erect, with head thrown back, and action sparing but effective. His voice was clear and charming as a silver bell, fit symbol of his transparently flowing diction and distinct conceptions. In matter he was accustomed to soar high, but seldom lost sight of the practical; in manner unaffected, and though not impassioned, solemn. When he adopted the practice of reading, so effective was it in his hands, that there was only an exchange of one means of impression for another. As pastor, Dr. Wardlaw was, while health allowed, a diligent and sympathizing visitor of his people. The affection between them was strong, and that of the latter was shown not only by the liberal income they furnished, but by a costly testimonial in 1837, consisting of a silver cup containing three hundred sovereigns, presented with a touching address by the senior deacon, as well as by the splendid jubilee subscription already noticed.

As a theologian, Dr. Wardlaw may be regarded as belonging to the transition from the stiffer and narrower notions of former days to the greater freedom of the present. The old traditional dogmas he tested and modified by Scripture. Dr. Wardlaw's reading in theology is said by his biographer to have been rather select than extensive. "The writings of Dr. Edward Williams, Andrew Fuller, Archibald McLean, and some of our older Scottish divines, such as Ricaultoun, he held in peculiar estimation, and upon them many of his own opinions were formed." (p. 481.) Dr. Alexander, of course, cannot mean by the remark at page 80, to disparage the Fathers, or to insinuate that Dr. Wardlaw did wisely in his late neglect of authors, whom—as well as the schoolmen—the biographer finding of some "value for the kind of theology to which his convictions and inclinations call him," quotes in the appendix *against Dr. Wardlaw*. In 1834, Wardlaw confesses to Woods, "I have paid very little attention as yet to the 'metaphysics of Kant, and the peculiarities of Coleridge,' respecting which you ask my

judgment ;” and immediately adds with a prudence and candour edifying to inferior men, “ were I to write about them at all, it would be very much in the dark.” He writes to Morison in 1852, “ I must confess, with regard to many, besides Coleridge’s, of the metaphysical and mystical speculations of our ‘ great thinkers,’ that, like Dr. Chalmers, ‘ *I am not yet up to them,*’ nor ever, I now fear, likely to be ; for, I confess, at my late hour,” &c. One of his sons writes of him :—

“ It is worth notice that he had little relish for the theological writings of our continental neighbours. Of *some*, indeed he could not fail to think highly ; but *there* were few in which he found much to admire, which was not to be found, though with less of a *philosophic* garb, in the best productions of our own divines ; and he always said he never could discover, even in the best, the wonderful depth and striking beauty which seemed to meet the eye of others, and to call forth their wondering admiration and fervent eulogy.”—P. 483.

Dr. Alexander remarks on Dr. Wardlaw’s “ Treatise on Miracles,” “ His strictures on Strauss and the Rationalists labour under the disadvantage of his having studied their views at second hand, and in some instances through an imperfect medium.” Some of Dr. Alexander’s readers may think of other respects, wherein Dr. Wardlaw might have been benefited as a theologian by an acquaintance, if not with such as Strauss represents, yet with some abler professor of “ mystified buff,” (p 463), who had presented in a more “ philosophic garb,” the doctrine of “ the best productions of our own divines.”

The following sentences of Dr. Wardlaw may be quoted for the edification of the party to whom they refer :—

“ When one looks at some of the Puseyites individually, men of acknowledged literature and science, *drivelling* as they do on some points—when we see such a man as Dr. Pusey himself writing with such mysteriously-solemn, long-visaged, and head-shaking gravity, things so self-contradictory and so absolutely infantile, on the words, ‘ *This is my body,*’ and putting himself, and endeavouring to put others, into a perfect agony of dread, lest he should be found doubting the mystery of the real presence, when the Divine Master so plainly affirms it—when, after all, the words, even to the understanding of a child, are so perfectly simple ; and when we add to this the very palatable nature, in many respects, of the Romish system, especially as it *externalizes* religion to such a degree, and to such a degree flatters and fosters the pride of self-desert in the natural mind, we feel that we can hardly hold our confidence, on the mere ground of the illumination of the nineteenth century, that that system may not yet gain the ascendancy, and ‘ all the world again *wonder after the beast.*’ But one recoils with a shudder from the very thought, and says emphatically, ‘ God forbid !’ Let us rather cherish the hope, that the prevalence of Puseyism may rouse the indignant spirit of another

Luther, to stir against it the slumbering zeal of insulted Protestantism, and work out a second reformation, with less of popery in it, than, alas! remained in the first, and more of the *spiritual independence of the church*. It is well that this latter principle is, on our own side of the Tweed, gaining ground so decidedly."—P. 420.

As theological tutor, Dr. Wardlaw was remarkable for the profound reverence for the Bible, which he exemplified, as well as directly inculcated in lecturing. Who shall estimate that healthy influence shed on his pupils, and through them on thousands more, by the piety of their teacher?

In politics, Dr. Wardlaw, who had probably at first inherited the principles of Toryism, became gradually liberal. In political economy, he adopted and advocated the opinions of Malthus; and in the border region of politics and religion, it has been seen how ably he contended for voluntarism, laying down the principle, that "the true and legitimate province of the magistrate, in regard to religion, is *to have no province at all*."

Taking Dr. Wardlaw altogether, as man, Christian, divine, it may be affirmed, that he reached a lofty peak of excellence, where few of his contemporaries are seen standing by his side, to share the veneration attracted thither, or to wield thence so wide and beneficent an influence, thereby greatly claiming the gratitude of mankind.

In his qualified eulogy of Dr. Wardlaw's "Treatise on Miracles," his biographer remarks, "On the whole, the work must be regarded as a solid, judicious, and most able defence of the main pillar of the Christian evidences." (P. 459.) Unless he means the *external* evidences, he differs in opinion from Dr. John Owen, who says, "Here we rest, and deny that we believe the Scripture to be the word of God formally for any other reason but itself, which assureth us of its divine authority. . . . We must come to something wherein we may rest for its own sake, and that not with a strong and firm opinion, but with divine faith. And nothing can rationally pretend unto this principle but the truth of God manifesting itself in the Scripture."—*Reason of Faith*. Vol. IV., p. 71, of Gould's edition of Owen.

Dr. Alexander gives a valuable critique on "Man's Responsibility for his Belief," wherein he adds to Wardlaw's doctrine, that men often refuse belief to a true and credible statement, because they are prevented by their affections from perceiving the evidence,—this, "that man is responsible for his belief as he is for his words or his deeds, because *he can and does regulate his belief by his will*." Dr. Wardlaw says, "That belief must necessarily correspond with the perception of evidence, it being in the nature of the thing impossible that the mind should believe, or disbelieve otherwise than as evidence is, or is not

discerned," is an axiom. This is of course denied by Dr. Alexander, who quotes on his side Clement of Alexander, Theodoret, Augustin among the Fathers, Alexander of Hales and Thomas of Aquino among the schoolmen, Luther, and Bacon. In another part of the volume, Dr. Alexander makes the important remark on Wardlaw's Essay on Faith, "A considerable portion of it is taken up with advocating the doctrine, that saving faith is simple belief of the testimony of God concerning His Son, as opposed to the view that it includes, as a necessary element, that trust in Christ to which the belief of the testimony naturally leads. With this doctrine I cannot concur, nor do I think it is one which the author has consistently adhered to throughout his essay." His main object, however, in reviewing the essay, is not to make such a remark, but rather to show the irrelevancy of this question to the author's theme. "The real question . . . is one on which Dr. Wardlaw has but slightly dwelt, viz., whether saving faith be an act of the mind terminating on something purely objective, be that Christ or only God's testimony concerning Christ, or an act having respect to the individual's own personal interest in Christ? . . . In order to refute this opinion (that namely which identifies faith with assurance), it is obviously the business of the polemic to show that faith is not that special belief in a man's own justification which some hold it to be, and out of which alone assurance could certainly spring."—Pp. 286—288.

The reader is probably aware, that Dr. Wardlaw, in his "Congregational Lectures," contends earnestly that *the* rule or law of morals has been given by the Divine Governor in the volume of Divine revelation. To establish this position, he argues from the present character of human nature, that the attempt to deduce a scheme of virtue therefrom is a mistake; and applying this test, in succession to the theories of ancient and modern moralists, especially that of Butler, he easily shows their inconsistency therewith, and of course infers their falsehood, as far as this question reaches. Many thoughtful men, however, seeing that Dr. Wardlaw's fourth lecture leaves Bishop Butler just where it found him, and grieved to find such a man as Dr. Wardlaw committing himself against that marvellous thinker, may be consoled to see, in the following sentences, that, in such opinions, his biographer does not share: "If the basis and standard of morality are both assumed to be without us, they cannot possibly be affected by any change that may have past over us since man was first made. . . . If morality, theoretically or practically, depend on the constitution God has given us, to affirm that that constitution is fatally vitiated, *quoad* this very thing, is virtually to pronounce morality an

impossible thing for us. . . . It seems then, that to apply this fact as a test of moral systems is irrelevant. . . . If moral disorder unfit a man for ascertaining aright the truths unfolded by the hand of the Creator in the constitution of the moral universe, will it not equally unfit him for ascertaining aright the truths unfolded by the word of the Creator in the Scriptures?" (Pp. 331, 332.) Dr. Alexander regards the article on this work which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, as "somewhat superficial." "Nothing, I think," Dr. Alexander goes on to say, on Dr. Wardlaw's Lectures, "can be more admirable and convincing than his proof, that the only foundation of moral truth is to be sought in the divine essence." In his sixth lecture, Dr. Wardlaw maintains the position, that "the will of God is not the origin of the principles of rectitude, but is itself determined by them." This, he thinks, it would be profanity to dispute. Yet, immediately after, he revolts from the notion of any ultimate standard of morality, but that of the Divine perfection as both "inconsiderate and profane." Here, however, it may, without profanity, be asked, whether the doctor has kept sufficiently in view the distinction between conception and existence. True, the Godhead is "the eternal and immutable prototype of all excellence," of which all other is a shadow, and whose radiation is inexhaustible. Yet, as Dr. Wardlaw himself, without "profanity or inconsiderateness," exposes the absurdity of asserting the ability of the divine power to effect *contradictions*, and as mathematical truth is independent of all actual existence, to seek for the idea of infinite excellence, realized by God alone, the Necessary, Perfect Being, is not an irreverent procedure. The last origin of this conception is, of course, the divine perfection; yet, unless Hegel is to be trusted, thought and being are distinct.

Dr. Alexander will hardly expect that his account in the preface of his unwillingness at first to undertake, at the request of Dr. Wardlaw's representatives, the duties of biographer, arising in part from a consciousness of dissent from several of Dr. Wardlaw's published opinions, will cause his reviewers to refrain altogether from remarking on his strictures on those opinions. Had he confined himself to a mere expression of dissent, as these opinions offered in the course of the memoirs, their part might have been silence; but the case is different when he gives ample comments on the doctrines of his friend, and expounds at length his own reasons for dissent. That Dr. Wardlaw should arrive at "the extreme conclusion of voluntarism, viz., that 'the true and legitimate province of the magistrate in regard to religion is to have no province at all,'" startles and grieves his biographer. "On what grounds, then,"

he inquires, "has Dr. Wardlaw rested this conclusion? In the first instance, on the assertion that Scripture has confined the the magistrate's functions within the sphere of civil matters. But has not the lecturer stumbled here at the very threshold? If the magistrate have *no* province in regard to religion at all, with what consistency can he be appealed to the Bible, the standard of religious truth and duty, to determine what his proper province is? if he may be summoned legitimately as a magistrate, to learn his functions from the Bible, how can it be justly said that he has nothing whatever, as a magistrate, to do with religion?" The twofold answer instantly suggests itself. First: even if Dr. Wardlaw believes that the civil magistrate, as such, has no province at all in regard to religion, yet, as Dr. Wardlaw is an inquirer after truth, and believes the teaching of the Bible on this question of political philosophy, as well as on other subjects, to be trustworthy, *he* is perfectly consistent in appealing to the Bible. Again: even if the magistrate, as such, has no province at all in religion, religion is surely competent when he offers his aid to reject it, and he is bound to listen and abide by her decision if she say,—*"All I want you to do for me is to leave me alone; get out of my sunshine."*

But as Dr. Alexander lays no stress on this objection, it may be passed over. Admitting on pages 386, 387, that "establishments and endowments of Christianity as a mode of promoting the religious education of the community . . . cannot be set up without doing violence to express injunctions of Scripture, superceding chartered rights of the followers of Christ, and entailing innumerable evils on the Christian cause;" he yet asserts on p. 385, that governments "not only have a province in regard to religion, but that it very greatly concerns them that their subjects should be instructed in those principles which can alone enable them to appreciate aright such legislation," namely, legislation on the principles of the Bible, and he stigmatizes as worse than Egyptian taskmasters "those who would bind the magistrate to secure the order and well-being of the community, and yet forbid him under any circumstances to provide that education by which alone this end can be effectually secured." In a word, Dr. Alexander means to advocate religious education by government. But ought he not distinctly to point out the difference in principle between "establishments and endowments of Christianity as a means of promoting the religious education of the community," and "the magistrate making provision for religious instruction." Until Dr. Alexander explains himself more clearly, some plain people will continue to think the difference so superficial as to amount at bottom to no difference at all. If a man is taxed to provide

religious instruction for himself or his children, the injustice will not be removed by "leaving it free to him to accept that instruction or not as he pleases." There is, doubtless, a difficulty in the question, "Who is to determine what is to be taught for religious truth to the community?" a difficulty which has proved so embarrassing to Dr. Alexander that he has had recourse to "the omniscience of Parliament—in the modified sense, of course, in which alone such language can be used of any human institution." But *extreme* men would here suggest three desiderata: first, that Parliament should actually, and not nominally only, represent the nation; secondly, that the whole nation, being Christian, should return the *élite* within it in piety and theological knowledge; and thirdly, that at least the more important religious diversities should cease, that there might be none in Parliament to mar its omniscience. This were doubtless "a consummation to be wished for," but till it arrives, *extreme* men will incline to regard the house as being yet far from omniscience, as even "helplessly incompetent in the department of theological truth." As for the comparison of the "bricks," it must be regarded as irrelevant, unless by a begging of the question. The blame of the embarrassment of the civil ruler in consequence of the neglect of any duty rests on those to whom the duty belongs.

This is a vigorously written volume. There are, however, some marks of haste—blemishes whose disappearance in a second edition were desirable. Thus on page 257, Dr. Heugh is said to have moved a resolution to which Dr. Wardlaw proposed an amendment; but on page 259, Dr. Wardlaw says that his "resolution of confidence and adherence" was the original one, and that Dr. Heugh's proposition of severance was the amendment. Sometimes there are sentences, which, by their careless construction, convey, if strictly construed, either no meaning at all, or one foreign to the writer's purpose. Thus, on page 244, "That he should have done so at the time the above letter was written, no one could expect." "Done" what? The preceding sentence does not inform the reader, but the meaning is left to be conjectured. Here and there are expressions which are somewhat below the subject, and some which are particularly offensive to southern ears. On the whole, however, Dr. Alexander has fulfilled his important task with an ability, prudence and geniality, honourable to himself and to Dr. Wardlaw, and largely claiming the gratitude of his readers. The book sufficiently recommends itself. It is worthy of the good and great name which it embalms, and both from that name and its own masterly execution, will speedily attain a wide circulation, be read with eager interest, and then laid up in

store. Successive generations of Christians will preserve it with their choicest treasures and legacies from the present. Would that every Wardlaw found an Alexander! It is not always that men see at once so noble a subject and so able an artist.

ART. IV.—*The Christian Life, Social and Individual.* By Peter Bayne, M.A. Edinburgh: Hogg. Pp. vi. 526. Cr. Svo.

It may be safely presumed that the writer of this book is a young man. The purpose and method of his work, the buoyancy and colouring of his style, the venturesome and crude opinions which he sometimes offers on knotty metaphysical questions, and the free, healthful sympathies that enliven his biographies with unfailing vivacity, all authenticate his youth. On this account we are more anxious to bestow that commendation on his labour which he has well earned, and to offer a few strictures which we trust will be understood to indicate our sincere respect for his ability, and our assurance of his future eminent usefulness.

This book will be widely circulated among young men. By the desultory reading, of which Mr. Bayne makes candid and penitent confession, and for which, therefore, we must forgive him, he has laid himself open to those influences that diffuse themselves so subtly and rapidly through the literature of our language, and which produce their first and most marked impression on the more inquisitive, susceptible, and unwary minds of young men. Hence, in following him through his pages, we find a succession of topics casually or minutely discussed, which suggest the names of our most conspicuous and influential authors who have given them prominence, and which embody without doubt the peculiar and urgent questions in philosophy and religion which are now agitating the minds of our most thoughtful and earnest students. It is emphatically a book for the times. Mr. Bayne has felt deeply, and pondered attentively those difficulties which he knew were pressing on the heart and brain of the men of his own age, whether in colleges or in factories; and he has had courage to publish his opinions in the hope of encouraging them, and helping them towards settled and truthful results. It is, therefore, a book written by a young man who expounds to us what is pretty generally, though perhaps silently felt by men of his capacity and class. It is, moreover, a book written to young men by one who has shown entire sympathy with them in their aspirations and independent search after truth. Such a book, being likewise

distinguished for the acuteness and freshness of its speculations and the graces of its style, must be read with avidity by young men. They will find in it the very subjects which have excited their attention, honestly and lucidly expounded. Many will be thankful for the instruction and guidance which is afforded; and others, if not always carried forward to our author's conclusions, will rejoice that he has presented these topics in a summary form, and brought such candour, zeal, and disciplined ability to the discussion of them. The importance of this work, its merits and demerits, may be estimated from these introductory remarks. We shall endeavour to gain for it the favourable regard of our readers, and to pay the "dues of courtesy" to our author by briefly explaining his intentions and his plan, and by appending such criticisms as we deem most indispensable.

We must condense our author's thoughts like "pemmican," and extract only a few of the multitudinous remarks straggling along our note paper if we fulfil the Horatian edict, "*quicquid præcipies esto brevis.*"

The first words of the Preface serve to explain and to apologize for the varied and discursive contents of the book; they are as follow:—

"Professor M'Dougall remarks on the too extensive diffusion of the idea that evangelical religion in its strict personal form, comports ill with solidity and compass of intellect. In the course of somewhat desultory reading, I was forcibly struck with the prevalence of the idea in certain departments of our literature; and it occurred to me that a statement of the Christian view of the individual character, together with a fair representation of the practical embodiment and working of that character, in our age, might not be unattended with good. With the first idea certain others became gradually allied, and especially it seemed to me important that the position and work of Christianity as a social and reforming agency should be at least in outline defined."

Since, therefore, the author was bound to trace the influences of Christianity as they are at work, both on the individual nature of man, and on social institutions, we easily comprehend why such a variety of topics came under his review: and from this confession, we further learn why all of them are exhibited under the new aspects they are assuming to modern inquiry. In order to grasp his aim most effectually, and to illustrate it most clearly, he has arranged the contents of the volume into three parts, which are respectively entitled: I. Statement; II. Exposition and Illustration; III. Outlook. The first part is devoted to speculation, and maintains these themes in two respective chapters. First, that the Christian religion alone gives rational

satisfaction to the urgent questionings of the human intellect; and a complete development of the entire system of the human faculties. Second. That the Christian religion is the only stable basis on which a commonwealth can be reared. The individual and the social life, therefore, can only be perfected through the Christian faith.

A rapid analysis of the first chapter will show our author's breadth of view, clearness of purpose, and fertility of resources. In one or two points we shall correct and supplement the metaphysical opinions he has advanced, in order that we may strengthen impreguably his noble argument.

He begins by seeking the origin of that anti-Christian spirit which has infected so much of our presumptive philosophy and popular literature; and he has rightly discovered it in the flattering doctrines of Pantheism. These doctrines as they are taught by Fichte and Carlyle, the chief apostles of this creed, irradiate from the central dogma of Man's divinity. The essential principle of Pantheism, as it is broadly asserted by Fichte, "ever is the glory, worship, and divinity of man," and from this principle, Carlyle has worked out a perfect scheme of Pantheism in application to practical life. Against Pantheism, the one point to be established from which all else follows, is the separate and personal existence of a Divine Being. By a fine instructive sympathy with the temper of our age, Mr. Bayne is led by preference, to develop that source of evidence which we believe to be now commanding the especial notice of our greatest religious philosophers, though he has been the first explicitly to announce and define it,—we mean, the proof of the existence of God which is drawn from our *moral* nature. After some criticism on the nature and functions of conscience, which, though shrewd and searching, is very defective, and would have been greatly modified by a more thorough converse with the subject, he methodizes this evidence under these two considerations: the last of which he thinks might be expanded into an irrefragable argument. First. The human consciousness as revealing itself in history has borne witness to the fact, that it is natural for man not to regard the voice of conscience as final. The monitions of conscience, whether they witnessed approval or reproach, have been always associated with the belief of a higher Being, whose smile has brightened, or whose frown has darkened the soul. Second. We are compelled by an original necessity implanted in the mind, to believe in the existence of a sufficient cause for every effect of which it is cognizant. The monitions of conscience are phenomena for which we must, according to this law, assign a cause. This cause is God; accordingly, the historical fact just mentioned, is at once confirmed

and explained. This is the necessity which has urged the human mind in all ages to seek its deity without itself. We do not accept this latter argument, which is a metaphysical blunder. The whole question, however, is of such vital importance, that we have postponed our remarks upon it to the close of this article.

But, if God exists? How can the Infinite One reveal Himself to a finite mind? The Bible has anticipated and confirms the last conclusion of philosophy, viz., that "a God understood would be no God at all. In the earliest age of Bible-teaching, we find it asked, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" but at the same time, it corroborates and responds to the yet more truthful, because instinctive conviction of the heart that we *must* have some knowledge of God, and some way of access to Him. Jesus Christ says "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, show us the Father." And the apostle Paul professed before the Athenian sages, his ability to reveal to them Him whom they had *ignorantly* worshipped. Mr. Bayne says, according to the Bible, "God is thus revealed, and we are able to approach unto Him; first, by a divine intimation that man is formed in the image of God; and, second, by the incarnation of the Godhead in Christ Jesus." This second doctrine, which affirms that He who has been from eternity, the Revealer, the Λόγος of the Inscrutable God, has also declared the Father unto us, is briefly, but ably expounded by Mr. Bayne. In this doctrine alone, mysterious though it be, are the contradictions of the intellect and the heart reconciled, the one protesting that God cannot be known, and the other that he must be known. So that the Christian the longer he meditates upon it, is profoundly satisfied, in both his reason and his faith, and delights in that mystery which answers the imperative demands of these once opposing elements of his complex nature. Through Christ we hold converse with God. This brings Mr. Bayne to the solution offered by Christianity of that problem of the individual life which is discussed by Fichte and Carlyle.

Both of these writers have depicted in ghastly colours, a state of mind in which amid convulsive throes and indignant loathing, it turns away from the pleasures of sense, and trembles with awe before the infinite mysteries of sorrow, and sin; and retribution, and they profess to tell us how the soul may emerge from this confusion and distress to noble and perfect manhood: "How perfect content is to be regained with one's position in the system of things; how love is again to suffuse the world, and over every cloud of mystery is to be cast a bow of peace."

We wish that Mr. Bayne in this part of his argument had

thrown back the mantle of his rhetoric and unbarred his strong arm to deal swifter and more telling blows upon his antagonists. The antics of his language occasionally oppress and enervate his logic; and we impatiently ask for simpler, bolder, and more impressive statements of the truth which he believes. It is said that no delineation of mortal confusion has been written to compare with the chapter on "the everlasting No," in Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus," and it will be difficult to find another description of serene, triumphant, and self-satisfied repose to equal the exquisite and glowing pictures in his chapter on "the everlasting Yes." But if we examine the reasons which have plunged poor Teufelsdröckh into the seething ocean of despair, or lifted him again to rest on the sunny hills of heaven, we seem to be tracing the phantasies of a dream, or listening to the successive sobs and laughter of a maniac. Who can tell why Teufelsdröckh is so affected with anguish and dismay? There is no guilt, no imperfection, no wrathful God, no future hell. He cannot blame himself; he has not an undeserved and inevitable fate to dread. Why, then, should he be wretched? Equally vain is the inquiry, why he should, suddenly and spontaneously, become so calm and entranced in happiness. Christianity has nothing to fear from this meagre, fantastic, and irrational philosophy which contradicts the stern and ineffaceable realities of human experience. *It* likewise recognizes a period of mental sorrow, and a subsequent period of forgiveness, and peace, and holy obedience, but it plainly enunciates those beliefs which produce these mental changes, and challenges mankind to say whether they be not true to the facts of consciousness, and do not afford a sufficient cause for the consequent effect.

Both Fichte and Carlyle tell us that the torment or fear endured in the first stage of the spiritual life is only "the stirring of the Divine principle within, and the expression of its unrest and embarrassment in the bonds of sense; but whence it has arisen that the Divine birth must agonize us, why the beginning is anguish, when joy, which is the companion of perfection—the guerdon of genius—is the progress and end," we learn not from their philosophy. And how is this fear disposed of? We are aware of no voice reaching the troubled man from heaven to whisper of pardon and invite to peace; we see no hand stretched out to remove sin or impart purity by one tremendous effort of will; no lengthened intelligible note, but by an abrupt Quixotic inspiration, he rids himself of terror, and declares that if hell must be endured, it must.

As Mr. Bayne observes, there is something fearfully grand in the representation of man raising his spirit, in composure and disdain, above all the evils of this life, and of a possible eternity,

but the representation is even poetically false, attributing to puny man that wondrous solemnity which Milton ventured to ascribe to the proudest of the fallen angels alone.

When we look into the Christian writings after reading these melodramatic fictions we seem to have awaked from a reverie to actual life, or to have landed on the solid earth, after floating through giddy and cloudy heights under a full-blown balloon. There is none of the parade, excitement, and deception of poetry in them; every statement is clear, direct, and palpable. We ask Fichte and Carlyle whence comes this torment of self-accusation and alarm, and their answer cannot be construed into intelligibility. Christianity affirms that it arises "from a sense of imperfection and a consciousness of guilt," and appeals for its veracity to the consciousness of every human being. These two philosophies ignore the latter fact altogether, and might as well, therefore, ignore the human soul itself, on whose behalf they pretend to philosophize; for what other fact has pierced the soul so deeply with torment, or streaked the scroll of history with such dark lines of tragic and continuous woe? But Christianity does not shrink from denouncing man's guilt; it probes and discovers the actual causes of his wretchedness, and then it unfolds the remedy; it reveals God to us—the infinite source of all perfection and blessedness.

His limitless glories, which rise and unfold in awful immensity before us as we draw near to Him, humble and yet elevate with inexpressible rapture the mind of His reverent worshipper. It reveals to us Jesus Christ in whom God, though unsearchable as regards his eternal and self-existent essence, yet speaks to men and communicates pardon; a present sufficiency of aid, and promises of future endless advancement. When this revelation is believed with the solemn and impassioned faith—which is alone possible concerning a subject of such sublimity and serious personal concernment (all other faith is illusive and dead), we see how peace—the peace of God which passeth all understanding—dawns upon the troubled soul with unearthly stillness and brightness even if the belief be groundless and fallacious. Yet there is sufficient cause in the grandeur and blessedness of the conceptions which it involves, and which are accredited by the mind, to produce that happy result; but who can say that it is fallacious, when it corresponds so exactly to every want of the depraved, impotent, and guilty soul. None but He who knew with perfect accuracy the universal wants of man underlying all transient differences of colour, customs, and creed could have devised a system which comprehends and satisfies them all.

Carlyle represents the exhausted spirit as receiving infinite

satisfaction and rest, by imbibing the incensed fumes of pride. Being a powerful opiate, they exhilarate and stupify the soul, so that Teufelsdröckh, like any Chinaman, sinks into his couch, and, after a whiff or two of self-congratulation, is wrapped round by gorgeous dreams, which banish for a while the sordid realities of life. Alas! for the the morning of eternity, when this debauch of intoxicating pride is over. Christianity humbles the soul, and does not, with cruel mockery, turn it back upon itself for the cure of that misery which has sprung from its own impotency, but it reveals to us an infinitely perfect God, whose love is the light of the universe, who is willing to absolve our guilt contracted against Him, and to supply every deficiency of our imperfect nature.

Let this doctrine of Christianity stand in its majestic representation of God, and its blissful correspondence with the craving of our soul, against the exposition of Pantheism by Carlyle, and if we consider them both as splendid and delusive romances, wholly unfounded in fact, the former commends itself to our imagination as inconceivably the more august in its conception; and it allures our affection by a more gentle, sacred, and omnipotent enchantment. If we are driven to the alternative, and must choose one or the other, as theories of the spiritual world resting upon equally balanced probabilities of evidence, it is surely a nobler, stronger, and happier faith to believe that we are brought into reconciliation and everlasting union with the infinitely perfect God, than to worship the blind, stunted, self-condemned, and miserable fragment of divinity which every man is said to carry in himself.

But are the probabilities of evidence equally balanced? Will any man compare the authority of "Sartor Resartus" as a revelation of the spiritual world, with the Bible? All kinds of evidence are afforded to attest the revelation of Christianity; and if these are accumulated in their complexity and aggregate form, they press the mind irresistibly to the conclusion of its *divine* origin. This fact is forgotten in our contentions about Christianity and rival systems. Thomas Carlyle thinks and writes as an erring, though a clever man; there is incontrovertible evidence apart from the inherent value, consistency, and adaptedness of his truth, to prove that Jesus Christ spoke with the authority and unfailing truthfulness of God.

Mr. Bayne concludes the chapter by a few fragmentary remarks on the four topics. First, the ethical value of the Christian theory of conversion, in that precise point where it contrasts with Pantheism. Second. The mode in which it tranquillizes the mind which is agitated by a sense of the sor-

rowful mysteries of human destiny, and the dark paths of divine justice. Third. The Christian theory of work. Fourth. The Christian theory of Heaven.

We have followed Mr. Bayne through his argument in the first chapter, that our readers may learn the character and tendency of his work. We cannot do the same with his second chapter, where he combats the doctrine of hero-worship taught by Mr. Carlyle, and proves that through the teaching and moral influences of Christianity alone, can the problem of social life be solved; and civilization be completed when freedom and law are harmonized in "the unity of the spirit." We observe here the same perspicuity of reasoning, the same tact in the disposition of his argument, and the same general correctness in his conclusions as in the first chapter. But the vastness and intricacy of the subject, stretching into endless ramifications, bitterly expose the poverty of his reading and his practical inexperience. These defects will be rectified by enlarged study and commerce with the world.

We are convinced, however, that the general tenor of his argument is sound, and we admire the pluck and strength which enables him to wrestle lustily with his burly foe, and to throw him in his own field. The instructions of a wise philosophy, and of matured experience, will amplify and correct his argument where it now appears jejune and defective.

To illustrate the positions laid down in these two chapters, Mr. Bayne has written six brief biographies of the following persons, John Foster, Thomas Arnold, Dr. Chalmers, John Howard, Wilberforce, and Budgett, the successful merchant. These biographies compose the second part entitled Exposition and Illustration; and, if we mistake not, will be generally esteemed the most interesting and profitable, as they constitute the largest portion of his volume. He had set a high model before himself in Carlyle's biography of Burns, and it is the highest commendation to say, that he has reproduced many of the best qualities of that marvellous literary production. His style is much improved in this second part. It occasionally flags into tame, nerveless monotony in pursuing the disquisitory arguments that commence his book; but no sooner does he get among these men whom he loves, than it springs up into elastic, and graceful, and abounding life. The fluency, variety, and flexibility of his language are remarkable; it is sometimes packed, and terse, and grave, as though written by a prompt business man, and sometimes it is copious, ornate, and musical, like the hymn of an oriental poet; and these differences nicely harmonize with the sentiments he wishes to express. His third part, entitled, Outlook, is a brief appendix to the body of the

work, and contains some earnest thoughts on the aggressive movements of positive philosophy and pantheism, which give point and practical bearing to the moral purpose of the preceding parts, and deeply impress the mind with the grave importance of these topics which Mr. Bayne has brought under our review.

Mr. Bayne will pardon us if we now criticize, without censoriousness, the defects of his book. "*Ergo fungar vice cotis.*" 1st. He prodigiously over-rates the capacity, wisdom, and influence of Thomas Carlyle. Having passed through a phase of mental experience in which Carlyle's influence predominated over his inmost thoughts, and held him in almost servile bondage, he thinks the world is still lying palsied under that thralldom whence he has escaped, and he hastens to destroy the giant in order to release mankind. Some six or eight years ago, it is true that young men were smitten with a frenzy for Carlyle, but this fever has died away; and while men yet wonder at the fervour, brilliancy, and terrific power of his imagination, they pity the unsoundness and aberrations of his intellect.

The whimsical, unnatural, and impracticable political doctrines propounded in his "*Latter Day Pamphlets*," and the cold, sneering, blasphemous scepticism expressed in his "*Life of Sterling*," have allayed the enthusiasm of even his juvenile readers, and stripped him of his once formidable "tail."

We regret, therefore, that Mr. Bayne has spoken in such unbounded terms of Carlyle's greatness, and that he has imputed such unwarranted importance to his opinions.

2ndly. Mr. Bayne often speaks with a tone of dogmatism and defiance, that will exasperate, but never convince his opponents. In truth, his peremptory manner of settling very complicated questions by two or three grandiose sentences, is apt sometimes to excite a laugh. His mind is very quick-sighted and impetuous in its decisions; and, generally, it must be granted, these decisions are just, but with the haste and zeal natural to his temper, there is allied a want of caution and of due respect for the opinion of others. For example: the summary method in which he imagines he has everlastingly settled the question of church and state alliance, however it may satisfy his Free Church brethren in Scotland, will appear absurd and presumptuous to the churchmen and nonconformists in England.

3rdly. While Thomas Carlyle has exercised predominant influence over Mr. Bayne's speculative opinions, it will be apparent to all his readers, that De Quincey is the master whose style he has laboured to catch in giving artistic expression to

these opinions. All the excellences of his style are formed upon a sedulous study of De Quincey. We can sympathize with him in his admiration for the elaborate elegance, the finished beauty of that author's compositions. The purity, lustrousness, and ethereal majesty of De Quincey's writing, always remind us of the magnificent water-temple described by Southey, in which blue gleaming pillars of water were overarched by glassy cascades, which beamed with every rainbow colour, and around this edifice was showered a torrent of spray, which glistened and played in the sunbeams like a fluttering silvery veil. But De Quincey's style is an emanation of his spirit, which cannot be borrowed and gracefully worn by others. We think, therefore, that Mr. Bayne has benumbed and weakened his composition by attempting such a close imitation. We like his writing best, when he is carried away by a natural impulse to a freer and rounder utterance than his wont. And we are convinced that an alternative study of Burke's writings would give robustness and healthful simplicity to Mr. Bayne's style, which he has sacrificed in order to gain the exquisite glossy finish of De Quincey's sentences: at any rate, he should omit no labour to culture that gift of language with which he is pre-eminently endowed, and to impress his composition with the inexpungeable mark of his own genius.

We subjoin our remarks on Mr. Bayne's two arguments given in proof of the Being of a *God*.

We believe with Mr. Bayne that it will be the greatest achievement in ethics to evolve the fact of God's existence from the consciousness of the human mind,—to show that this fact is involved in the constitution of our moral nature, and in the necessary conditions of its activity. When this problem is solved, the attempt of Descartes to rest the first fact of the universe upon the infallible basis of consciousness will be accomplished. The "religious" faith of Kant and Fichte, which they excluded from metaphysics as irrational, though they accepted it as true, will be harmonized with reason as forming one of its constituent elements; and articulate utterance will be given to that dumb religious instinct which has universally compelled mankind to believe in the intelligent, self-determining God or gods. This instinct upholds the faith of pious millions who need no further evidence in its support, and during the season of trial exposes the disbelief of the atheist or pantheist to be a mere assumption and sham, which belies the deep, indelible conviction of his soul, that a personal God exists. We expect, and believe, that this vast and sublime argument will soon be elaborated and consummated by a fitting man.

The first consideration offered by Mr. Bayne is an historical

fact, and not a philosophical principle. It only states what the metaphysician must explain. An atheist will admit the fact, that men generally believe in an unseen, powerful, and personal Being, with whom they are most intimately connected, and to whom they are somehow accountable. This belief finds ready admission into the infant's mind, and soon suggests itself even to an untaught child. It prevails and rules with despotic power over the debased minds of barbarians. It awakens in fiery horror, armed with sudden, unreasoned, irrepressible conviction, amid the deepening shades of death, when they gather round the life-long atheist. How men thus readily, instinctively, and tenaciously believe in the God or gods, is the question which the metaphysician must answer; he must trace and unfold the secret principles of the mind which infallibly produce this result. Does the metaphysical law mentioned by Mr. Bayne in his second consideration, give the required explanation. Manifestly not. When we speak of the judgments of conscience, and the appropriate emotions attached to them, we must recollect that conscience merely denotes a faculty of the mind, and does not exist apart from the mind any more than the faculty of reason or of taste. The mind itself is a determining or final cause—a *causa causans*. When conscience approves or condemns any action, a strange and solemn influence is felt to belong to its decision, which obliges us to acknowledge its supremacy,—

“Thus conscience does make cowards of us all.”

but if asked the cause of that moral judgment, we must reply—the mind itself. Else what were the meaning of the words *self*-approval, and *self*-condemnation. Just as the mind is able to judge concerning the truth of propositions, and the beauty of material objects, so it is endowed with the higher faculty of judging concerning the moral value of voluntary actions, and as there are secret and universal principles, which originate and direct the mental process of judging upon truth and beauty, so there are innate principles which determine the mind in its moral judgments. It is the task of metaphysicians to lay bare the action and inter-action of these formative principles or laws, but in every instance—intellectual, æsthetic, or moral—the immediate and proper cause of the given judgment lies within the mind itself. The judgment of conscience is the final authority to the human soul, but yet it proceeds from that very soul which is mysteriously urged to obey its own behests. We cannot, therefore, attribute the monitions of conscience immediately to God as their cause, any more than we attribute to him the phantoms of imagination, or the convictions of truth: all are the products of an independent, free, and self-determining

soul, which retains in its essential freedom and self-sufficiency, the impressed likeness of God.

Mr. Bayne's considerations thus fall short of the intended mark. The first states the fact, that the voice of conscience is universally deemed the voice of God; but the second does not account for the fact. No truth is more generally approved, than that we are brought into most proximate relation with God; and that we are most profoundly impressed with the fact of His existence through our moral nature; but hitherto this experimental evidence of natural theology has not been elucidated and formularized.

We suggest the following observations, in order to vindicate Mr. Bayne's argument.

The mind, while we are conscious of its being the efficient cause of its own judgments and volitions, is itself an effect. It is an organized structure of rare, subtile, and awful properties. Different faculties, processes, and emotions belong to it; but these are not isolated and held apart from each other. They are all united to the central will, and interwoven by the unconscious and unsearchable force of mental association. They thus hold definite and fixed relations among themselves, and are kept in perpetual sympathy with each other. The mind, therefore, is an organization as much as a plant or the human body, being a system of powers which are connected, and sympathetically developed according to predetermined and unchanging laws.

When we consider a mind so constituted, the conviction is forced upon us, that it must have had a Master as *decidedly*, as when, according to Paley, we look at a watch which we picked up on a desert heath. In fact, precisely the same evidence is afforded in this case, as in the other examples of natural theology. Neither the powers of the soul, nor their disposition have originated in ourselves, and consequently we *must* ascribe them to a higher power, who has both formed them, and marvelously adapted them to each other, and to the external conditions of our life.

The wise intention of our Maker is revealed to us in the organization of our mind, as well as in other organized beings. When, therefore, we know the proper function of any faculty, we are instantly assured that it was formed by our Maker for that specific purpose, and that His purpose is thwarted, if that function be violated.

Now the function of conscience is manifest. Other faculties of judgment are exercised on foreign and impersonal objects, viz., propositions and symbols; but conscience only judges the free determinations of the personal will. The will has the authority of might over all other parts of our spiritual nature.

Conscience holds the authority of right over its executive power. *Conscience* is thus the supreme governing principle in man. Seated on its lofty throne, and swiftly approving or condemning whatever issues from the will, whether it be spoken with the tongue and acted by the hand, or hidden in the secret current of thought and desire, its judgments are felt to bear a peculiarly solemn import, and an unquestioned authority. It is a fact of universal consciousness, that a strong obligation is laid upon man to accept and follow its verdict. We now understand why the decisions of conscience are so naturally and generally attributed to God. The relation of the conscience to the personal will,—the authority and constraining influence that accompany its judgments, belong to the constitution of the mind, and therefore express the purpose of God. He willed *that* conscience should hold the supreme position, and exert the paramount authority over the entire soul, and therefore its authority represents His. The principles, according to which conscience operates, were implanted, and therefore conscience, in each particular instance, *declares* the will of Him who, with a free will, has given us those moral laws which should regulate our freedom. Nothing can be plainer than that it is the design of our Maker that conscience should reign in the soul, and that the principles of its government are derived immediately from Him, so that men are bound to believe “the voice of conscience to be the voice of God.”

But why should men be more powerfully impressed when they know that God has formed their conscience, and that it operates according to the laws which He must have assigned to it, than when they know that He has framed trees and worlds; and that they likewise exist and have their being according to the laws He has impressed upon them. In other words, why is it that we are moved and awed by the fact of God's existence mainly through our moral nature.

1st. It is only through conscience we know God to be a moral being. The cause must always contain the effect. He who has taught us to discriminate right from wrong, must be able himself to do the same. The principles of our moral nature are derived from Him, and therefore are possessed by Him. Such is the sublime and conclusive logic of Holy Scripture. “He that planteth the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that teacheth them knowledge, shall He not know?” In looking upon the material universe, we only discover proofs of the *might* and *wisdom* of God. The *revelations* given there of His “eternal power and Godhead” are stupendous and insufferably glorious; but by the constitution of our mind we are bound to acknowledge moral excellence

as a more sublime, awful, and adorable attribute than the skill and force which are witnessed in the multitudinous movements of the universe, and which are alike infinite in the minuteness and vastness of their perfection. Hence it arises that all His rational creatures are most impressed by the revelation of God given in their moral nature. The angels in heaven bow before Him, and "cry out, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty;'" and on earth His saints "give thanks at the remembrance of His Holiness."

2nd. It is through conscience that the fact of God's existence is pressed upon us as one of infinite personal concernment, affecting the entire scheme of duty, and involving tremendous consequences. His existence might be denied and forgotten if He were such as Epicurus pictured the gods of his mythology to be; but this is impossible. If He exist at all, there must be momentary dependence upon Him, and accountability to Him. Were we merely endowed with intelligence and volition, we could then study the wonders of His handiwork with zest and instructive profit; but His character and His relations to us could not have *awakened* the profound interest with which they are now invested. *Our moral convictions* give intensity to our belief in the Being of God. *Conscience asserts* our responsibility and supreme obligation to serve Him. The dark thoughts of guilt, the agonies of remorse, and the fear of retribution, brood within the soul which is convicted of the crime of godlessness; and these give fearful distinctness to the *idea of God* which can never be afterwards erased.

Apart from conscience there is no personal interest attached to the idea of God; but when conscience speaks we *feel* that it is with Him we have to do,—that He has a just and absolute claim over our entire life, and that our endless destiny will be fixed according to His award.

How can we be otherwise than impressed with the fact of God's existence when considerations like these are connected with it?

In addition to this argument, we will suggest some other remarks, which point to another recondite but more *influential* source of evidence, which lies in the moral nature of man.

1st. *It is an indisputable fact that* faith in a supernatural power is the only moral influence that can temper and indurate virtuous principle against the temptations of vice. *Faith in God* is essential to the pure and earnest culture of our moral nature. The Scriptures proclaim this fact, which is exemplified either positively or negatively by every man in these words: "The just shall live by faith." Dr. Arnold, has forcibly stated the conclusion to be drawn from the fact: "Let a man live on the hypothesis that there is no God, the practical results

will be had, *i. e.*, a man's besetting and constitutional faults will not be checked, and some of the noblest feelings will be unexercised; so that if he be right in his opinions, truth and goodness are at variance with one another, and falsehood is more favourable to our moral perfections than truth, which seems the most monstrous conclusion which the human mind can possibly arrive at." *

2nd. It is still more remarkable that as men become more conscientious in their modes of thinking and acting, their faith in the existence of a God becomes a more intimate, valued, and settled conviction. In exact proportion to their moral progress does this *faith* grow in its power and assurance within the heart; and this result does not arise from an increased acquaintance with logical and external evidences, but a new source of internal evidence has been opened up, the light of which outshines and darkens the light of all other evidences combined; so that a good man will arise with a conviction of certainty, stronger even than his belief in his own existence, there must be a God.

We should like to unfold the different elements of this new conviction, but our space forbids us to attempt more than to note down these thoughts.

The man who has lifted the scope and purpose of his life above the examples of society and the cravings of his sensitive nature,—who has determined at all cost and hazard to do only what is right, is oppressed with a consciousness of the weakness, loneliness, and insufficiency of his spirit in the task before him; but from this gloomy consciousness—as flame from smoke—a *joyful faith* in the presence and available strength of God is born. *This faith* is grasped by the soul as its only hope and life; and it is a faith justified by philosophy. How would God indicate to man the narrow path of rectitude unless he were willing to lead and guide him therein?

2ndly. As our moral nature is purified, the soul attains higher conceptions of Moral Perfection; it is often entranced with these visions of spiritual loveliness, and *yearns* to be itself clothed with the beauty of holiness. Whence come these conceptions of what has never been witnessed save once on earth? That perfection, which, the mind contemplates, finds no embodiment in any human life; and *hence* the good man believes it to exist in the unseen God. Now, without assenting to the axiom of Descartes, that the distinct idea of God proves His existence, or that the idea of such holiness proves its existence, yet we can readily understand why, as his conceptions become more vivid and blissful, the good man is increasingly assured that they are

* Life and Correspondence, vol. i. p. 312.

realized in God. God has gifted him with the capacity of imagining a perfection which has no archetype on earth; he must himself, therefore, since the cause contains the effect, possess that perfection which He enables the mind of His creature to conceive.

3rdly. *Without faith* in God there is no *comprehensive* purpose that could act like a lens to bring into one focus, and to give intensity to all the aspirations of a conscientious man. As these aspirations increase, he becomes more conscious of this imperious want, and is impelled to believe in a God who comprehends all excellence, and *whose* will is the fountain of all virtue. When this faith is possessed, his strenuous exertions after perfect virtue are not scattered and disjointed—one purpose combines them into a sublime unity—he labours only to serve his God.

4thly. The good man increasingly feels the solemn obligation of conscience, and, in fact, can explain why such grave importance is given to its *moral* judgments. If a man, save the existence of a moral God, feels the grasp of conscience on his heart, he must ask with trembling—Who gave it such terrific power? and nothing will withstand or gainsay the answer which flashes like an inspiration on the mind—It is God. If these judgments of conscience were *merely* the fancies of a crazed imagination or the indoctrinated maxims of the schools, they would never press themselves with such absolute *authority* on the mind; they cannot be escaped, however much the mind is disposed to dispute or spurn them. Again, if we believe in God, the restrained and hateful service of abstract duty is changed into the spontaneous and happy obedience of a child to his father. The light of divine love dawns upon his soul; and immortality, with its homes of peace, is unveiled before us.

We know that these are not direct proofs of the being of a God, but they prove that the *Soul* of *Man* in its very structure, and in every capacity and desire which it possesses, is adapted to the condition of that great fact, so that it is perfectly satisfied and developed only when the existence in God is believed. We learn, also, from these considerations why a man who enjoys the growing fulness of power and blessedness which this faith imparts to him, and who, therefore, is experimentally assured that faith is the indispensable condition of this spiritual life, becomes so penetrated with the conviction that “God exists,” that no other fact—neither his own existence nor that of the world—is equally certain to him. In that highest fact all that constitutes the glory of the world’s existence and his own is involved. If it be denied, the universe is darkened, and his soul collapses in despair.

ART. V.—*The Illustrated Hand-book of Architecture.* By James Fergusson. 2 vols. Murray. 1855.

THERE exist already in our language several works which profess to give short, concise, and popular statements of the characteristics of the different schools of Architecture; but which, unfortunately, are far from fulfilling the promises conveyed in their titles. It was, therefore, with a feeling akin to impatience that we expected the appearance of Mr. Fergusson's Hand-book, so long and so liberally advertized. There was, moreover, something in the previous history of Mr. Fergusson of a nature to invest the appearance of his long-expected work with unusual interest; for his travels had furnished him with opportunities of studying, on the spot, the physical conditions which were likely to modify the outward expression of society manifested by its buildings, and his extensive reading was known to have stored his mind with the means of comparing these various phases of the development of our intellect. After an inexplicable delay, Mr. Fergusson's Handbook has appeared, and we confess candidly that its perusal has been to us a source of great and bitter disappointment. Undoubtedly there is much skill, research, and industry, displayed in the collection of the materials which form the staple of this work; but it is even still less worthy of the name of a Hand-book of Architecture than such works as Gwilt's "Encyclopædia," infinitely less than Ramée's "Histoire de l'Architecture," Batissier's "Histoire de l'Art Monumental," or in a more contracted sphere than Peyré's "Manuel de l'Architecture Religieuse du Moyen Age," notwithstanding Mr. Fergusson's condemnation of them.

Before, however, stating our reasons for thus taking exception to the artistic details of Mr. Fergusson's book, we would beg to record our protest against the very incorrect grammar, the bad style, and the awkward turns of phrase which abound in every page of this ambitious work. We had hoped that bad grammar had been the especial prerogative of government documents, and that the monopoly of that defect had been retained for the bills presented by cabinet ministers, or for blue books published by the recently created government commissioners. Alas! Mr. Fergusson has proved that it is possible even to rival Dr. Waller Lewis in the manner in which the English language may be distorted; and he has adopted a style which may serve to keep in countenance the worst productions of the Board of Health. The manner in which the "Hand-book of Architecture," has been "got up," to use a trade expression, is also as objectionable as the style of Mr. Fergusson's composition; and, without being

hypercritical, we believe that we are justified in protesting against the form under which this work has been presented to the public. It is very badly printed; the ink and paper are such as ought never to have been used in a book intended, avowedly, to serve as a text-book. There is, moreover, something equivocal, at least, in the manner in which the woodcuts engraved for Mr. Murray's other publications are made to "coldly furnish forth" the illustrations of a work asserted to be original. This may be an ordinary proceeding in the trade, but there is an expression in page xi of the preface so obscurely worded, that unless particular attention were paid to its construction, it would produce the impression that "all the woodcuts" were "expressly executed for the work;" and we would, therefore, urge Mr. Fergusson, or Mr. Murray, to remove the appearance of bad faith which this second use of the cuts in question must produce. Mr. Fergusson has himself laid such stress upon the genuine character and the correctness of the illustrations of his work, that the species of delusion to which we have alluded becomes the more startling.

Nevertheless the difficulty of producing a work of the character of Mr. Fergusson's Hand-book, and the merit of succeeding to the extent which he has done, are so great, that we feel considerable hesitation in calling attention to the errors that gentleman has fallen into. He invites, however, with such candour and true love for his art, the criticisms of fair and impartial readers that it appears to be our duty to point out what we consider to be the defects in an attempt otherwise so commendable. It would be as difficult, perhaps, to follow him into all the details of the subject as to write a similar work. Our observations, therefore, will only apply to the general principles, or to the broad historical development of the art as sketched by Mr. Fergusson himself, and more, indeed, to the personal opinions he expresses in his preface and introduction, than to the substance of the historical part of the work. We believe that it is more necessary thus to dwell on what may be called Mr. Fergusson's articles of faith, because with all sincere men, such as he is, fundamental principles modify the appreciation of external phenomena to such an extent, as to enable us, from the general principles they adopt, nearly to predicate the manner in which they would describe what they see.

Mr. Fergusson states that the object of his work is, "by supplying a succinct but popular account of all the principal buildings of the world, to condense within the compass of two small volumes the essence of the information contained in the ponderous tomes composing an architectural library; and by gene-

ralizing all the styles known, and assigning to each its relative value, to enable the reader to acquire a more complete knowledge of the subject than has hitherto been attainable without deep study." After so express a declaration of the extensive and universal range of the investigations undertaken, it must appear strange that nothing beyond passing allusions have been made to any of the modifications of the Renaissance, or to the Cinque-Cento, or to the Louis Quatorze styles, or to the earnest attempts of the modern German and French architects to eliminate a mode of expressing visibly, by Architecture, the spirit and tendency of the times in which they live. The value of a retrospective review, such as Mr. Fergusson has undertaken, depends principally upon its comprehensiveness—upon "its supplying a succinct account of all the principal buildings of the world." As a guide for future efforts, we would also observe, this work could only be entitled to the same character of comprehensiveness on the condition of carefully discussing whether our race is likely to pursue the steps which must either lead modern societies aside from the cultivation of true art, or such as would give them an impulse likely to produce nobler results than have hitherto been attained. We believe that the latter will be found to be really the case, and that the future destinies of Architecture will be more glorious even than its past career; but without here entering upon the discussion suggested by this consideration, we may fairly express our surprise that Mr. Fergusson should have ignored the productions of a period during which the human mind had in other arts and sciences exerted itself with a sustained energy—had displayed an originality and achieved a progress beyond parallel in its previous history. It is true that a certain school of architectural critics, composed principally of men who have never executed a single building, and are, therefore, necessarily theoreticians, affect to despise the merits of some of the phases of architectural development they cannot appreciate or understand; but Mr. Fergusson has shown himself so superior to this school, that we are at a loss to explain his reason for the singular omission to which we allude.

Most distinctly do we join issue with Mr. Fergusson in the attempt to range all the various modes of architectural expression under the two great divisions of Christian and Pagan art. He is not alone in the endeavour to arrogate the title of Christian to a style of Architecture which, it must be confessed, has only been applied in some countries where Christianity exercises its inestimably beneficent influence. But Mr. Fergusson and his friends forget that the early Christians for centuries adopted the Architecture of the ancient world; and that, at a more recent period, Europe deliberately laid aside the style of art

asserted to be particularly characteristic of its faith, to return to one it is now the object of a certain school to hold up to ridicule and contempt. It may, indeed, be fairly questioned whether it would not be as correct to designate the style of Architecture which prevailed in Western Europe, during the Middle Ages, by the name of feudal, as by any other; for although we do not usually attach any meaning to that word separate from the political constitution of society, and, therefore, may be startled by its application to the style of art observable in religious constructions, yet it is not the less the case that the feudal system so decidedly and distinctly impressed itself upon all the modes of thought and action pervading society during its reign, that its name may well be taken as characterizing the precise epoch during which the phase of architectural development alluded to prevailed. It is certain that the transition from classical to mediæval architecture corresponded chronologically with the transition from the ancient forms of government to the feudal system,—that the style of Architecture in question attained its greatest development at the period when the feudal system had succeeded in establishing itself thoroughly, and in moulding the whole frame of society to its own image; and that precisely in proportion as the feudal system was broken down, did its cognate style of Architecture decline. The term Gothic, after all, seems to us to be even a more correct indication of the origin and character of the Architecture of Western Europe the new school of critics persist in calling Christian, than that more religious title. The Gothic tribes appear almost alone to have practised it, with a real vital faith in its excellence; the Latin, the Hellenic, and Slavonic races endeavoured to eliminate for themselves a new and distinct style; but this was as much inspired by the Christian feeling as the form of art adopted in the West of Europe, whilst it is as distinctly separated from classical art as its contemporary. The fact is that the modes of expression of the human intellect cannot be brought under any such arbitrary classifications; and the terms, Pagan and Christian Architecture, are worse than ridiculous, because they only tend to mislead. There is no common, or, so to speak, inevitable principle pervading the styles Mr. Fergusson calls Pagan, which should justify their being grouped together; nor has Christianity always adopted an external architectural symbol so peculiar as to entitle it to be called "Christian," to the exclusion of all others. We wish, however, not to be misunderstood on this matter. When we contend that Christianity, *in se et per se*, has not produced a distinct style, we are far from contending that it is powerless to modify the expression of men's thoughts as exemplified in

Architecture. On the contrary, we believe that the purer religion did much to modify and improve the tone of sentiment ruling the heart of hearts of society in Western Europe, and that there was and is a deep feeling, unknown to the professional men of the purest epochs of classic art, even in many of the worst buildings of ancient or modern Christian times. The philosophical mind is not so painfully impressed with the recollection that he is contemplating "temples made by men's hands," even in some of the architectural abominations of the last fifty years, as it is in the religious edifices of antiquity. But the influence of Christianity upon Architecture seems to us to be confined to its effect upon the sentiment with which the architects worked; whilst the manner of such working—the style—in fact, depended upon the organization of society in political matters, far more than upon its religious belief. The peculiar turn of mind incident to race has also exercised an amount of influence upon the development of architectural excellence, which has not been sufficiently appreciated by Mr. Fergusson and his friends; and it is one we would commend to the especial consideration of inquirers into the principles of æsthetics.

By the way, we here take an opportunity of reminding Mr. Fergusson, that when he is discussing the merits of two styles, he only considers them comparatively, and that, therefore, the use of the superlative degree is a mistake in grammar. He uses the phrase, "as the Gothic is certainly derived *most* directly from Rome, and is by far the *most* important style of the two," &c.; when he ought to have written, "*more* directly," and "*more* important." We do not desire to be hypercritical, but really the man who attempts to lay down laws of art, ought not to offend against these simple rules of grammar.

But if we pass from this technical detail to the consideration of the principles which Mr. Fergusson endeavours to inculcate with respect to "the true principles which ought to guide us in designing or criticizing architectural *objects*" (we think the word *subject* would have been more appropriate), it will be found that he has reasoned, with respect to them, as incorrectly as in the attempt to restrict the application of the term Christian Architecture. For firstly, there can be no more reason to stigmatize the Cinque-Cento, the Renaissance, or the Louis Quatorze styles as *shams*, than there can be to apply that fashionable cant phrase to Roman, or even to Greek art. The latter were, after all, but gradual developments of the styles those respective nations borrowed, or inherited, from other countries; just as the styles of modern Europe, subsequent to the revival of classical literature, were borrowed from the

examples of ancient architecture still in existence, or from the writings of Vitruvius, whom our merely theoretical critics of the present day pretend to treat with such utter scorn, because, it is sorely to be suspected, they cannot even read his works in the language in which they were originally written. We agree with Mr. Fergusson that no society can produce a real, earnest form of art, unless it labour to make that form in strict conformity to its own distinctive character, and such as to express the modes of thought, and even the social organization, of the people to whom it is applied. In this sense we yield our entire assent to his denunciation of shams; but we are far from being convinced either that the revived classical Architecture of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, was not "a real and earnest form of art," or that our modern revival of Gothic Architecture is not entitled to that praise. Men did really and earnestly worship the ancients, and the modes of thought of a certain period of classical antiquity, at the time when M. Angelo, Raffael, and Titian painted; Palladio, Scamozzi, and Vignola built; or Giovanni da Bologna, Cellini, and Jean Goujon carved; and surely the works of those wonderful men were sincere enough to remove them from the category of shams. Wren, Perrault, and Mansard thought for themselves with sufficient vigour and originality to warrant their exclusion from so sweeping a censure. And again, the revival of Gothic Architecture in the present century corresponded with so mighty an intellectual movement of the human race; it was connected, in fact, with so remarkable a psychological phenomenon that it cannot by any means be set down to a superficial or fashionable whim of the moment, or fairly be called "a sham." The revival of the style we persist in calling Gothic corresponded, it is to be observed, with the reaction of men's minds from the negative analytical philosophy of the eighteenth century, and was connected, intellectually, with the introduction of the historic-romantic school so worthily represented by Scott, Hugo, and Manzoni. Having felt the inanity of the doctrines of the philosophers who had prepared the destruction of the forms of government and the modes of faith possessed in Western Europe, men turned with "a longing, lingering look behind" to the opinions and forms of a society they believed to have been blessed with stronger faith than they themselves had in their respective destinies or modes of belief. People became admirers of Gothic art, of mediæval institutions and literature, because they had ceased to attach any serious importance to the art, institutions, and literature around them; and because they hoped by a return to a former state of society to fill the dreary, aching void of faith under

which they knew existing society was suffering. To say that they who headed this movement were not earnest is, we think, to display a want of power to appreciate noble motives, mistaken though they may be : to say that there is no real art in many of our modern buildings is simply, in our opinion, to confess an absence of artistic perception. We are far from advocating any description of revival, be it classical or mediæval, which is not removed from copyism ; but we hold that both revivals may be consistent with good faith and deep convictions, and, as such, perfectly able to produce schools of art sufficiently real and earnest to warrant their exclusion from any sweeping accusation such as Mr. Fergusson has addressed to the profession of Architecture in Europe during the last three or four hundred years. If there be any meaning in his attempt at a second classification of Architecture into two great divisions—of true and sham, it is because the former is inspired by, and represents visibly, a definite condition of the human mind at the time of its production, whereas the latter is but a pale copy. Neither St. Peter's at Rome, St. Paul's, the Louvre, the Invalides, the Escorial, however, can be said to have been produced by men who did not feel, or express the tendencies of the ages in which they lived : nor can it be said that our modern Gothic Architecture is not a fair exponent of a passing revulsion of public opinion to a state of things happily long passed away. Such schools are retrospective instead of being prospective, and Mr. Fergusson erred in not discovering this radical and fatal defect in them, which must always render those schools sterile in the perpetual onward movement of human society. Equally was he in error when he said that they were not real and earnest, for that depends on the professors, not upon the effect produced by an art. Mr. Fergusson must, we fear, still learn the lesson that calling nicknames by no means proves a fact ; and that the consideration of the intellectual phenomena of an active, energetic age is not to be disposed of in a few sentences.

Then Mr. Fergusson has been singularly unfortunate in his attempt, in Diagram No. 1, to illustrate what architecture really is, and in what its merits consist. He takes, firstly, a façade of a width we will call unity, and he then proceeds to consider how this element of the problem may be handled, and gives drawings of five modes of so doing ; but the width of the second compartment is only about three-fourths of that of the first, that of the third is equal to the second, that of the fourth is nearly equal to the first, or to unity, whilst the fifth is equal to twice the same unity ; so that the comparison between these different designs is rendered impossible by their

varying dimensions. If, however, we pass over this inexplicable inaccuracy, and examine the various designs and Mr. Fergusson's explanations of them, they will appear more unaccountable still. The second design differs from the first, which is nothing but a brick wall with square holes left for windows and doors, simply by the introduction of pilasters in the spaces between the openings, by crowning those pilasters with some kind of impost, and connecting them, under the coping, by means of arches of a more or less ornamental character. Mr. Fergusson proceeds to say that this division of his illustration is better than the first: "The arching of the upper windows binds together the weakest parts, and gives mass where it is most needed to resist the pressure or thrust of the roof; and the carrying down the piers between the windows gives strength where wanted." Now in these few words there are precisely as many philosophical errors as there are distinct assertions. Arches do no act to bind parts of a building together; but, on the contrary, unless their effects be counteracted, either by the inertia of their abutments, or by the adhesion of the cementing materials with which they are constructed, they act decidedly to disrupt the mass. Then, it would have been necessary for Mr. Fergusson to have given some description or sketch of the roof to be employed over a building of this character, before he cited, as a merit of its design, that the increased quantity of material at the top of the wall increased the resistance to the thrust of the roof. "In any very common-place utilitarian building," the kind of roof usually employed is either what is called a **V** roof, or it is a tie-beam roof with king or queen post truss; neither of these exercise any thrust upon the walls beyond that produced by their dead weight; so that the increased thickness Mr. Fergusson calls an improvement, is firstly useless, and secondly injurious, because it is applied in a situation where the leverage it would exert on the foundations would be most sensibly felt. As to the additional strength given by the pilasters between the windows, it may be required to support the arches; but unquestionably the design given by Mr. Fergusson contains no indication of its being wanted for any other purpose. "In this stage," says our author, "the building belongs to civil engineering, which may be defined as the art of disposing the most suitable materials in the most economical, but scientific, manner to attain a given utilitarian end:" it being, however, to be observed that hitherto Mr. Fergusson has said nothing on the subject of materials, to which he would, from this sentence, appear to attach so much importance.

The third division of this illustration differs from the second

in the introduction of some panels in the blank spaces, of some dentil ornaments in the cornice, and in the advancing the pilasters under the archivolt. How the materials can be said to be "better disposed" constructively in this case than in the last is, we confess, as difficult to be understood as the "better disposition" of the materials grammatically. There is nothing in the design to account for the manner of arranging the materials in either case; and with all deference to Mr. Fergusson, Mr. Pennethorne, or any other architect's opinion, we contend that it is almost always a mistake to panel brick or stone walls, because the motive for panelling is simply to save material where large spaces have to be covered, and where strength is not required. The dread of blank spaces is but a sorry proof of the taste of an architect; no good engineer would regard panels as conducing to the more logical distribution of materials. "The ornament is not *more* than would be considered, in some states of society, indispensable for even the *most* utilitarian buildings. The cornice" (which appeared in the second division, by the way) "may be said to be required to protect the wall from wet; the consoles to support it" (the wet? or the cornice?); "and the mouldings at the springing of the arches" (which also appeared in the second division) "may be insertions required for stability." Why, we pause to ask, this attempt to depreciate utilitarian buildings, or what does the phrase mean? is utilitarianism a reproach? Wiser men than Mr. Fergusson have held that usefulness was a source of beauty, and certainly they were nearer to the truth than the man who could use the word "utilitarian" as a term of contempt, without explaining his reason for attaching a new and unusual meaning to it. But, to continue our quotation. "In the present day, however, even this slight amount of ornament is almost sufficient to take it" (what? the antecedent to which Mr. Fergusson refers, "the building," is only to be found in a sentence separated from this relative pronoun by four full stops) "out of the domain of useful art into that of Architecture!" Oh! most lame and impotent conclusion! We are, on Mr. Fergusson's authority, in future to consider that Architecture is not a useful art, notwithstanding the universal opinion to the contrary which has prevailed since the world began. Nor is this a casual or unintentional admission; for in his notice of the fourth division of the diagram, Mr. Fergusson makes the claim of the design to rank as high art, depend entirely upon the amount of ornament applied; whilst "the fifth division carries the advance still farther." The fifth division being twice as wide as any of the others, it is, we would observe, absurd for Mr. Fergusson to attempt to draw any

comparison between the distribution of the parts, or to argue with respect to their grouping, under circumstances so essentially different.

"If it is" (instead of, if it be) "admitted that the last division in the diagram is an object of Architecture" (instead of, an illustration of the application of Architecture) "which the first is not, it follows from this analysis" (there has been none, but only a description of the assumed characteristics of the designs) "that Architecture is nothing more, nor less, than the art of ornamental and ornamented constructions" ("the analysis" having only treated of ornamented constructions). Such is the language, such the reasoning, and such the æsthetical philosophy of Mr. Fergusson with respect to the art he professes to cultivate! Most decidedly and distinctly do we demur to the whole system so expressed, and in direct opposition to him do we maintain that ornament, so far from being the aim and end of the architect's labours, is but an accessory—often a very insignificant accessory too, withal—to an art which deals with abstract science and with the application of all descriptions of knowledge of physical laws, quite as much as with the study of form, or of picturesque effect. Mr. Fergusson, in fact, degrades Architecture from the rank of a scientific pursuit to the level of the scene-painter's art; and the species of contempt with which he speaks of the modern subdivision of Architecture, known by the term of Civil Engineering, proves that he knows but little of the real characteristics of either that branch, or of the parent stem, Architecture.

We dwell upon this fundamental error of Mr. Fergusson's opinions with respect to what Architecture really is, and in what its merits really consist, because the ideas formed upon this subject, must give the key-note to all future reasoning upon the art to which they are applied. In our opinion, Architecture consists in the study and the application of the means and appliances by which the wants of society are supplied in all matters connected with building, or with the infinite variety of objects comprised by the ancient Romans, under the term "ædilité." For many years, in fact, Architects were road-makers, bridge-builders, hydraulic engineers, and undertook, as their very name implies, the task of directing and guiding all the workmen engaged in those various pursuits. In more modern times, Inigo Jones, Mansard, and Mylne, were architects and bridge-builders—of surpassing merit, too, in their own days. Leonardo da Vinci, M. Angelo, and Da Vignola, were as skillful in military, as in civil engineering and architecture. And although, from the marked differences of style observable in the civil, or, to quote

Mr. Fergusson's word, "the ornamental" buildings of the Roman Empire, and the constructions, such as bridges, aqueducts, &c., of the same epoch, he would call "utilitarian," it may be suspected that the same artists were then rarely employed to superintend both classes of operations, yet there is no trace of such distinction between the "useful" and the "ornamental" branches of the art to be found in any ancient author. Even in modern history, and notwithstanding the propensity of our civilization to divide and subdivide labour, it is hard to define where Architecture begins, or where civil engineering ends; and, perhaps, after all, the best mode of characterizing the difference between those pursuits would be, to say that the latter is more immediately concerned with the application of the arts of building when it is only necessary to study the rational and economical application of the principles of the physical laws involved; whilst the former admits, in addition, of the study of picturesque effect. Such a distinction, however, is more apparent than real; for, in the first place, a building cannot be executed in strict conformity to natural laws, without being at the same time entitled to be considered beautiful; and any one who dispassionately investigates the æsthetic effects of Peyronnet's or De Prony's bridges, of Smeaton's lighthouse, of Telford's, or of some more recent engineers' viaducts, must admit that they are as entitled to be called works of high art, on account of the simplicity and grandeur of their outlines, the arrangement of their masses, and even their effects of light and shade, as the most highly decorated works of our most renowned modern architects. Mr. Fergusson's very badly worded observations on this subject, may, therefore, be passed over. In the second place, the provinces of the civil engineer and of the architect, are not, we believe, necessarily distinct; for if he, like the vulgar world, recognize any difference between the professors of the two branches of the same profession, the explanation is only to be found in the incompleteness of the studies of those professors themselves; and, perhaps, one of the reasons why Architecture does not occupy the position in social estimation, to which it is entitled as a profession, is to be found in the fact, that architects do not strive to be "the chief workmen," and have latterly concentrated all their attention on unnecessary ornament, or unmeaning detail. The aim and object of their art ought to be to render the various buildings with which they are concerned, consistent with and indicative of the wants, thoughts, feelings, faith, and intellectual condition of the age in which they live. All this may be done without ornament of any description; and to say, therefore, that Architecture is the art of ornamental or ornamented construction, is to mistake one of the means for

the end,—“it is to worship the gods amiss;” and the sooner architects turn to the studies, which, if we are to believe Mr. Fergusson, they have abandoned to the civil engineers, the better it will be for the interests and the dignity of their own profession. Sir Christopher Wren never called upon a civil engineer to assist him; nor did he, as Mr. Fergusson recommends, “delegate the mechanical part of his task to another,” in order to restrict himself entirely to the artistic arrangement and ornamentation of his (whose? the engineer’s, or the architect’s?) design; but we are convinced that any candid observer will at once admit that there is infinitely more artistic merit in the outline, even if there be defects in the details, of St. Paul’s, than in the joint production of Messrs Barry, Reid, and Walker, notwithstanding the lavish abuse of ornament upon the latter. There must be uniformity of design in any really great work of art, such as can rarely, if ever, be attained when its elimination is entrusted to several independent minds. Mr. Fergusson’s notion of leaving the arrangement of the constructive details of a large building to an engineer, and that of the artistic details to an architect, would, therefore, in our opinion, simply result in a failure in both respects: division of labour is, after all, only admissible when the operation to be effected is purely mechanical, and when it is already so well understood as not to require the *mens divini* of the designer. The style of reasoning, however, which our author has adopted on this subject is so singularly confused, and he contradicts his own previous assertions in so extraordinary a manner in the subsequent parts of his observations, that it is almost impossible to form any opinion as to his real meaning, or to grapple seriously with his propositions.

It is, indeed, very painful to be obliged to follow the dogmas of a man who has evidently received so little logical, or grammatical, training as Mr. Fergusson appears to have done. He goes on to say that one great cause of the confusion which has arisen in applying criticism, or in defining architecture, is to be found in persons applying to the constructive art of architecture, principles derived from the imitative arts of painting or sculpture, while in fact no two things (he has cited *three* forms of art) could in reality be more essentially different. “Neither painting or sculpture were ever useful arts, except” (thus, after making a direct assertion, destroying it by a very equivocal exception) “in the most barbarous times, and by the most remote analogy.” “Their object” (that of the times, the last antecedent? or that of painting and sculpture, as we gather from the context?) “is to tell a story, to reproduce an emotion, or to pourtray a scene or object of nature,” &c. “Architecture, on the other hand, was originally one of the useful arts, invented

to provide for one of the three great wants of man," &c. "In none of its stages is imitation an element of composition," &c. "A building can tell no story, and it is only by inference that it can be made to express an emotion!" These are broad and tangible assertions in their distinct form; but we very much question, from the tenour of the rest of his work, whether Mr. Fergusson meant them to be understood literally; and certainly there is hardly one of them which is not capable of refutation, or which does not require modification.

None of the authors, whose works we have been able to consult, have seriously confused the principles which regulate arts so essentially different as those Mr. Fergusson has alluded to, and although certain fanciful resemblances have been supposed to exist between the proportions of some of the orders, and of the male and female figures, we confess to an utter ignorance of serious attempts to judge of Architecture by the principles admitted in painting or sculpture. But be that as it may, it is to say the least, singular that our author, who has hitherto made one of the great recommendations of Architecture consist in the assumed fact that it is not utilitarian, should, at this stage of his reasoning, dwell upon the fact that neither painting or sculpture were ever useful arts, as a proof of the absurdity of applying the same description of reasoning to them and the useful art of Architecture. It is equally inexplicable that Mr. Fergusson should insinuate that "in the most barbarous times," painting and sculpture as arts were useful. As a means of communicating knowledge by a species of pictorial writing, or as a means of maintaining in the minds of the populace some semblance of devotion by recalling the images of the objects of their worship, it is true that painting and sculpture might be considered to have exercised such influence upon society as to be entitled to be considered useful arts in barbarous ages. But most distinctly do we assert that the measure even of usefulness of those arts has increased with the advance of civilization; and that "to tell a story, to reproduce an emotion, or to pourtray a scene or object of nature," is likely to produce, really, a greater and more useful effect than any end to which painting or sculpture could be applied in barbarous ages. The usefulness of intellectual pursuits of the highest kind cannot be appreciated without an effort of the understanding, and it would not have been a source of surprise had we met with the expression to which we so strongly object, in the works of ordinary observers. But for an artist such as Mr. Fergusson desires to be considered, and really is, to convey the deliberate impression that other branches of art as noble as his own are useless, is "flat heresy."

To say that "in none of its stages was imitation an element

of composition," is either to play with words, or to overlook with strange carelessness the development of Architecture, as recorded in the Hand-book itself. A great deal of the transitional Buddhist Architecture is evidently imitated from the style of composition adopted in the rock caves of their predecessors; whilst the Lycian monuments bear unmistakable impress of a style of composition imitated from the wooden huts of other periods. The Egyptian art, and that of early Greece and Asia Minor, are also strongly impressed with the characteristics of an imitation of a style of composition rendered necessary by the use of materials essentially different from those employed at later periods of the civilization of those regions. And though there may be something strained and far-fetched, in the analogy between a grove of trees and a Gothic cathedral, yet there is still to be discerned in Gothic art an imitation of natural objects which must make us demur to Mr. Fergusson's broad and unmodified assertion. Alas! we fear that it is precisely because imitation has been in so many of its stages an element of architectural composition, that its followers have neither merited nor attained the consideration to which their profession would otherwise have entitled them.

But the strangest assertion of all, in this most strange introductory chapter, is that in which Mr. Fergusson says that "a building can tell no story, and it is only by inference that it can be made to express an emotion!" We are sure that no man of education and taste can agree with an opinion so diametrically opposed to the feelings and convictions of every form of society. It may be that to understand thoroughly the meaning of any work of Architecture, a considerable degree of cultivation is required; but to say that such buildings as the Pyramids, the rock-cut temples of India or Egypt, the Parthenon, the Colosseum, our marvellous Gothic cathedrals, St. Peter's, St. Paul's, or even the outside of St. James's, Piccadilly—ugly as it is,—to say that any, or all, of these buildings can tell no story, is to avow an utter absence of the power to "find sermons in stones, books in the running brooks," without which it is impossible to become an artist. Victor Hugo felt more truly, and expressed himself more correctly, when he said that "he who knew how to observe, could distinguish the character of an age, even in the design of a door-knocker;" and Mr. Fergusson himself contradicts his previous denunciation of the want of expression in Architecture, so far as to say that all true Architecture develops its various styles in such strict accordance with natural laws, that is possible, from a small fragment, to restore the whole of a ruined edifice, which would evidently be impossible, if there were no voice or understanding in the art which

co-ordinated those ruins; and, moreover, he adds, (p. iii.), that "Architecture is, in all cases, as correct a test of race as language, and one far more easily applied and understood." If this be so, how can he pretend that Architecture can tell no tale? A fine building will always shadow forth the ends for which it was erected, the social state for which it was designed, and the extent to which its designer had identified himself with the feelings, wishes, belief, and intellectual character of his age. A building cannot be true, or beautiful, without being harmonious in all its essential parts; and in contemplating a fine cathedral, or, in fact, any other beautiful building, to whatsoever end it may be devoted, we ourselves have always felt an influence analogous to that described by old Sir Thomas Browne, in the case of the church music upon himself, which influence, by a fine enthusiasm, he extended to "even that vulgar and tavern music." "There is something of divinity in a harmonious edifice more than the eye discovers: it is an hieroglyphical and shadowed lesson of the whole world and creatures of God; such a harmony to the eye, as the whole world well understood would afford the understanding." We do not believe that there is any affectation in claiming a state of feeling or frame of mind so well expressed by the slight alterations we have made in Sir T. Browne's words. There must be many educated, and uneducated, who think and feel in this matter as we do; and to say that to such people "a building tells no story, and that it is only by inference it can excite an emotion," is strangely to mistake the constitution of the human mind. We cannot believe that Mr. Fergusson means what he thus appears to say, for the whole tenour of his arguments upon beauty in Architecture, is to show that unless a building bear the impress of thought, it cannot be true or worthy of admiration; but the power of producing the mere perception of this thought, is, in itself, "to tell a story, to express an emotion," and the most favourable explanation to be given of the contradiction is that Mr. Fergusson is still sadly deficient in the art of clearly expressing the thoughts which float in his mind.

The manner in which Mr. Fergusson has explained his opinion upon "the leading principles and elements" of Architecture seems to us as open to serious objection as the preceding portions of his theoretical ideas on its end and aim. He says that "the first and most obvious element of architectural grandeur is size." This is a truism, for no object can be considered "grand" unless it be large, or unless we change the meaning of that particular epithet. But we suspect that Mr. Fergusson meant to use the word "sublimity," instead of grandeur: at any rate, it would have been more logical, and would

have agreed quite as well with the subsequent reasoning. Stability he makes the most important element (of what? of architectural grandeur?) next to size; and it must be admitted that it is an essential element of architectural beauty. But when Mr. Fergusson says "that all utilitarian exigencies, and many other obvious means of effect, are sacrificed to this" (what?), "and with such success, that after 3,000 years, still enough remains" (of the Hypostyle Hall at Karnac) "for the admiration, which even the most unpoetical spectators cannot withhold from its beauties," he makes a singular jumble of causes and effects, of subjects and objects, which renders it almost impossible to understand what he really means. In the first place, stability itself is essentially a utilitarian exigency in a building; and if it be attained, it is impossible to say that all utilitarian exigencies are sacrificed. In the second place, we cannot understand the necessity for a poetical imagination to perceive the beauties of a building in which everything has been sacrificed to the production of the effect of stability; and, lastly, Mr. Fergusson, who had hitherto simply discussed the question of architectural grandeur, in the case of the Temple of Karnac, introduces the far more complicated one of beauty. In the remarks upon the porticoes of the Parthenon and of the Pantheon, our author also strangely reverts to the consideration of mass as an element of grandeur, for he makes the superiority of the former—which, by the way, we are hardly prepared to admit—consist in its strength and solidity, as proved by the greater areas of its columns beyond those of the Pantheon. The same may be said with respect to his remarks upon the Norman cathedrals, for evidently he considers that their solidity depends upon their mass, and in nowise upon the constructive skill necessary to inspire the idea of stability without reference to that of mere juxtaposition of materials. As for the remark that it is more difficult to make a brick-and-slatted cottage look picturesque, or well, than to attain the object with rubble stone, or even mud walls and thatch, it must be evident that considerations of mass or stability have nothing to do with the question. Rubble stone or mud walls may be more picturesque than those constructed with bricks; but certainly they are not more stable, nor can the spectator from the outside usually perceive that they are more massive; as to the thatch, there can be no doubt with respect to its instability; and oddly enough, Mr. Fergusson, the bitter enemy of shams, dwells in this case entirely upon the *apparent* solidity of the coarser materials. The errors of Mr. Fergusson, in his appreciation of the artistic, or rather the æsthetic, effect of the three elements of mass, stability, and material, are mainly, we believe, to be attributed to the narrow

view he has taken of this portion of the subject. They all act to excite the imagination or the feelings of the spectator, individually or collectively; but the most serious impression they can produce arises more from the vague idea of force exerted and difficulty overcome,—of labour, skill, and self-sacrifice,—than from any physical beauty in the objects themselves. It may be true that “if a brick and a stone edifice stand close together, the design of both being equally appropriate to the material employed,” the effect of the former would be inferior to that of the latter; but we suspect that the manner of accounting for this fact is to be found rather in the necessity for adopting, for a small material, a design of an inferior character, than in the size or quality of the material itself; and we doubt seriously whether the introduction of the most expensive descriptions of bricks would ever obviate the effect produced by the design required for the application of that particular material.

Whilst upon this part of our subject we would observe that it always appeared to us that one reason why the architecture of Paris is superior to that of London, is to be found in the fact, that in the former city building stones, easily wrought and of large dimension, being obtainable at small cost, the architects of that city are enabled to treat their buildings without reference to the conversion of materials of small but definite sizes. The same effect may be observed in many of our own provincial towns, and the buildings of Edinburgh, of Glasgow, Bradford, Leeds, and Bath, have a monumental character, which, all things considered, is far superior to that of similar constructions in our metropolis. But that the definite dimensions of the bricks have great influence in producing this result, is, we believe, proved by the more picturesque character of the constructions erected with small irregular rubble masonry.

Mr. Fergusson's remarks upon construction are as objectionable, in our opinion, as those he has made upon mass, stability, and material; and, indeed, there can be no reason why, having discussed the second of the elements of Architecture, as he calls them, he should return to the consideration of “construction,” which means nothing more than the application of the conditions of stability. It would lead us into a repetition of much that we have said with respect to the limits of the subdivisions of Architecture and civil engineering, were we to dwell upon the numerous errors of this part of Mr. Fergusson's theory; but there can be few professional architects of eminence, we should hope, who would consent that the public should believe that it was a fundamental dogma of their profession that “they ought always to allow themselves such a margin of strength that they may disregard, or play, with their construc-

tion." Really, if architects are thus to be taught to squander money in order to produce what they themselves call ornamented, or ornamental, buildings, there can be little reason for surprise at the ease with which the new class of civil engineers have "thrust them from their stools." The language of this portion of Mr. Fergusson's book is equal to the logical sequence of his ideas; and we earnestly recommend him if he should ever publish a second edition of the Hand-book, to allow a sincere friend to correct the innumerable grammatical errors of which he and the Rev. Charles Penrose seem to have been unaware.

Upon the subject of form, of proportion, of ornament, of colour, uniformity, imitation of nature, and of ethnography, as treated in this book, we have little to say beyond this, that we are puzzled to discover what connexion ethnography has with the principles of Architecture, although, of course, we are prepared to admit that it has much to do with the modes of its expression. Our notice of the introduction to the Hand-book has indeed extended to such a length, as to leave us little space for an examination of the body of the work; and, therefore, we dismiss the important questions raised by Mr. Fergusson upon those divisions of his subject, and also with respect to a new style, and the prospects of the art, by observing that we agree, in the main, with him. To say that the human intellect is powerless to produce a new style of Architecture, is to assume that its progress is susceptible of limitation in one of its spheres of activity, whilst we know that in all others there is actually going forward a struggle, and that an advance is being made which bids fair to leave far behind all the past efforts of our race. We live in times when all the physical and intellectual faculties of man are strained to the uttermost; and social and moral revolutions are taking place around us on every side. It may be that the result of this mighty turmoil may not be conducive to the immediate happiness of the generations immediately exposed to its effects, just as the destruction of the Roman empire, and the diffusion of Christianity, appeared for ages rather productive of misery and suffering, than of the blessings they ultimately procured for Western Europe. "Suffering is perhaps the badge of all our tribe" during periods of revolution; and so we may be destined to pass through long phases of misery ere we arrive at the correct solution of the great social problems which have forced themselves upon public attention of late years. There is abroad, and at home, an uneasy dissatisfied spirit at work, which makes men believe that the system of organization, which has so long prevailed, is not in accordance with the feelings, or the wants of humanity. Society is in the throes of a new birth, and if the result of this labour

be to inaugurate a condition of humanity superior to any of those which have yet prevailed, we may be sure that it will make to itself new forms of artistic, and of poetical expression, as characteristic of itself as the Classical and the Gothic art and literature were of their respective periods. When living Dantes and Giotto shall have identified themselves with the humanity around them, they may strike out a path as original, and as immortal, as those created by the master-minds of the Middle Ages. The first thing needed for the invention of a new style of Architecture, is that the professors of that art should turn their backs resolutely on the past, and advance boldly with the society around them towards the future; at present, they are like rowers who look in a direction opposite to that in which they seek to advance. Ecclesiologists, and the amateur public, cling, we believe, to past forms of art, because artists themselves neither believe in the present or in the future. Let but a few earnest men arise to show what can be effected by a strong faith in the real end and objects of art, viz., to express visibly the sentiments, thoughts, and feelings of the actual period, and the exclusive fashions for classicality or for mediævalism will pass away. Errors will be committed no doubt. There will be many failures, and much disappointment; but eventually, and in proportion as society assumes the definite form it must shortly approach, will a new style of art be eliminated. Mr. Fergusson says truly that no great result of this description has ever been produced by individual efforts. Men are somewhat like beavers: their great works must be produced by long-continued and collective efforts. The impulse once given to our race, however, the end must be worked out; and as beyond the shadow of a doubt, we are on the verge of a great change in our social state, so we may be sure that Architecture, sooner or later, will participate in the movement, and new styles will arise.

The detailed history of the progress of Architecture, introduced in Mr. Fergusson's Hand-book by the observations we have felt it our duty to notice thus at length, will serve to point the moral of the observations we and our author have made on the circumstances which are likely to produce such new styles of art. Every distinctly defined community—that is to say, every community possessing a social organization, a code of laws, a form of belief, exclusively its own—has, in the course of time, produced its own characteristic literature and Architecture. This tendency of men to range themselves in what may be called national, intellectual series is even observable in modern Europe; for the various states, though evidently derived from the same stock, and having a faith which only differs from one to the other in minor points of doctrine, besides inheriting the same

traditions from the ancient world, have, nevertheless, their own peculiar characteristics in art and literature. In ancient times, when communications were more difficult between the various states than they are now, and knowledge was far less generally diffused, these differences were more strongly defined; and as may be learned from the Hand-book, the visible expression of the various states of society, as manifested by the styles of Architecture they adopted, differed in an equally marked manner. When, either from excessive barbarism, or from the prevalence of Socialist doctrines—the point at which the excessive refinement of modern times seems likely to meet barbarism—when individuals are effaced before the state as the representative of all society, then nearly all the forms of art concentrate themselves in the edifices required for the purposes of religion, or in palaces, or public places. Our notions of ancient Architecture, in fact, are derived from buildings of those descriptions, and it is very remarkable that the remains of the domestic constructions of all the schools grouped by Mr. Fergusson under the title of Pagan (if we understand him aright), are so insignificant that it is hardly possible to say how they were adapted to the wants of the people. We have no traces of Greek houses, very slight ones of those in Asia Minor, merely pictorial representations of those of Egypt, and had it not been for the miraculous preservation of Herculaneum and Pompeii, little or nothing would have been known of those of the Romans. The traces of ancient civilization to be observed in the monuments which have survived to our age are, therefore, to be considered rather as representing the abstract than the intimate feelings of the nations who executed them. Yet how infallibly has it happened that every distinctly new and original form of organization has produced its own peculiar art, and bearing this law in mind, the study of the various styles recorded by Mr. Fergusson rises from a mere question of archeology to the rank of an essential branch of the study of the history of our race. At the same time, the more we examine this portion of the subject, the more we must be convinced that there is still hope for the production of a new style, could our society only assume a new and distinct form.

It would require far more space than we have now at command to examine in detail the historical part of Mr. Fergusson's Hand-book of Architecture. It is carefully and elaborately prepared, we would however observe; but, unfortunately, it is also disfigured by the bad grammar, the slipshod style of composition, the want of logical arrangement, a narrow view of the various descriptions of operations which either now or formerly constituted the province of an architect's duties, and in some cases

also by either great carelessness or deficient scholarship. Thus, at page 29, he describes from Captain Kittoe's account a set of caves in the Berar province under the name of the Berar Caves, whilst Captain Kittoe himself calls them the Burabur Caves, and there is in Mr. Fergusson's use of the name Sat (or Sut) Gurbha, a confusion which it would require a knowledge of Indian languages to unravel. At page 283, there is a very meagre account of the Greek theatres, notwithstanding the number of interesting documents upon the subject in Texier's "*Asie Mineure*;" nor does the notice of the Roman theatres at page 329, fill up the deficiency. The description of the Roman bridges and aqueducts, at page 365, is singularly meagre and defective; and the very cursory way in which the mode of using materials during the classical periods is alluded to, is far from being satisfactory. Mr. Fergusson's deficiency of logical perception is, however, most apparent in his remarks upon the Sassanian Architecture, for he quite overlooks the possibility that the captive Romans, or the inhabitants of the Roman provinces of Asia Minor, are quite as likely to have given origin to the style he calls Sassanian, as that the style should have originated in Persia at that peculiar period. The character of the Architecture of the Palace at Serbistan (cut 304, page 372) and that of the gateway at Firouzabad, is decidedly a debased Roman; moreover, the history of the epoch between the reigns of Severus and Justinian would lead us to believe that the stream of civilization, and, therefore, of communication of principles of art, should rather have flown from Rome to Persia, than that the Persians should have eliminated a style of architecture from some rude notions of the Parthians or Scythians, to be afterwards diffused over the Byzantine Empire. There is a very singular paragraph at page 952, in which our author asserts that the order represented in cut 782 (same page) is less classical than that represented in cuts 404 and 406, page 527; from which, if it had not escaped his notice in the hurry of composition, we should be much inclined to question Mr. Fergusson's appreciation of the so-called Classical art. At page 959, also, there is a singular error repeated twice, which we call attention to as a striking illustration of the carelessness we reproach to a work otherwise so valuable. It is said that the church of St. Nicodemus (Panagia, Lycodemo, *sic*,) is the principal church at Athens; but the word "Panagia," the term usually applied to the Most Holy Virgin, can have nothing to do with St. Nicodemus; and again, there can be no reason for writing *Lycodemo*, instead of *Nicodemo*. The account of the Mahometan art in Spain is singularly defective, for it contains hardly any allusion to the extraordinary modifications super-

induced by the irruption of the Moors of Africa, about 1091, when the Saracenic kingdom was beginning to wane; nor can the account of the Mediaeval French Architecture be considered more satisfactory because an attempt has been made in it to group the marked local varieties which prevailed in that country, into divisions which are both too few in number, and too absolute in character.

Altogether, we repeat that we rise from the perusal of Mr. Fergusson's Hand-book with feelings of great and bitter disappointment, mingled with sincere regret that so much pains, and so much industry and conscientious love for Architecture, should not have secured a more satisfactory result. A good hand-book of Architecture is still wanting. They who would in the meantime acquire tolerably correct opinions on the history of the various stages of its development, may refer to Mr. Fergusson's book; but we recommend them by all means to correct the impressions they receive from it by reference to other, and more detailed works. The little histories by Ramée and by Batissier, are still the best we possess on the general progress of Architecture. It is painfully mortifying to be obliged to express such unfavourable opinions upon the labours of a man we personally respect; but the irreflective commendations which have been lavished upon them render it necessary to speak the truth plainly and distinctly. It is possible, that at some future day, we may return to the examination of the historical part of this work, for we feel that we have made that portion of our notice too subservient to the discussion of Mr. Fergusson's personal opinions upon æsthetics. Should a second edition be called for ere then, we recommend Mr. Fergusson to carefully revise the result of his long and arduous labours, if he desire to leave an enduring reputation in the art he loves so well; and amongst other details, to reconsider the remarks upon the construction of domes at pages 441 and 442. As they stand, they are worse than nonsensical, for they are radically incorrect, and lead to an unfavourable explanation of many of the opinions expressed in the previous portions of the work. The only valuable observation upon this branch of construction which Mr. Fergusson has inserted is that in which he says, that "if the section of the dome, given in cut 352, represented an arch or vault," it could not stand one hour, but he ought in fairness to have added that the merit of calling attention to the flat contradiction given by the oriental domes to the usually received theories on that subject is originally due to Mr. J. W. Papworth. The display of constructive reasoning on the subject made by Mr. Fergusson is radically defective, for the secret of the resistance of the oriental domes lies entirely in the adhesion of the materials, and is only

so far affected by the disposition of the materials in the supporting walls, as that if the latter fall, evidently the domes must fall also. There are other errors in the opinions contained in this work on the subject of construction which really do make us regret that some civil engineer had not been consulted with respect to them, or that Mr. Fergusson should not have studied the science of his profession with the same zeal he has evidently bestowed upon its history, and upon its ornamental details.

ART. VI.—*First Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners; together with Appendices.* London. 1856.

ALTHOUGH the Russian war has entailed upon this country sacrifices so numerous, varied, and severe, as to project the shadow of comparative adversity over coming years, yet that calamity has not been without a few important compensations.

To discover a disease, and to ascertain its nature and extent, is only next in importance to a cure: as respects the administration of our public affairs, we have gained this terrible advantage to an extent which society but a few years ago would not have deemed possible. The practice of purchasing commissions,—officers whose incapacity was notorious,—promotions by seniority, rank, and court favour, rather than by merit,—placed in the highest positions of the army and navy, a number of men one-half of whom were disqualified for their duties by age, and the other half by inexperience; while in the various departments of the civil service, the system hitherto pursued has been corrupt from beginning to end. Venal constituents have sold their votes at the poll for a promise, and to redeem that promise venal members of parliament have sold their votes in the House of Commons for the gift of appointments for the constituent and his sons in every branch of the civil service.

The results, we say, of these baneful and corrupt systems, have shown themselves in all their frightful dimensions during the progress of the Russian war. Incapacity, neglect, and blunder have been the three fates that have woven the tissue of its history. Abroad, an army whose sustenance and comfort were provided for by the almost unlimited use which parliament was willing to make of the resources of the exchequer, has perished, man and beast, for want of the essential necessities of life, food, medicine, shelter, and clothing. Trumpery fire-arms, trumpery pickaxes and tools, and the criminal omission to construct roads and vehicles, the toils and perils of an un-

paralleled siege, orders misgiven and misunderstood, officers disunited by jealousy and pique, a staff of feather-bed soldiers with superannuated commanders; and, worst of all, clashing departments at home,—Admiralty, Horse Guards, and Ordnance, mutually thwarting each other—with their practical business performed by clerks so grossly ignorant and incompetent, that they could not earn porter's wages in any commercial house in London;—all these causes, in combination, have led to inconceivable sufferings with correspondent mortality, and to miscarriages which have covered with disgrace, before the gaze of Europe, both the military and the administrative character of Great Britain. But by a benign social law, whose action produces the cycles of national history, when evils and wrongs become so flagrant as to threaten the very existence of states, they originate their own cure, though sometimes by a political spasm that threatens to be fatal. Happily our own country is little subject to spasms, and its diseases are remedied by a *vis medicatrix* dependent on the good sense and good feeling of the bulk of the community. The first symptoms of the sanative process were the establishment of the Administrative Reform Association, and the appointment of a Royal Commission to superintend the examination of all candidates for appointments in the Civil Service of the crown. It is not our present design to comment upon the constitution, the acts, and the projects of the Administrative Reform Association; but to gather up from the Report before us, and to present to the reader, a statement of the history, thus far, of this most important Commission, and to offer some suggestions as to the means by which the success of its operations may eventually be rendered complete.

The order in council, by which the Commission was constituted, bears date the 21st of May, 1855, and sets forth in its preamble, that, "it is expedient to make provision for testing, according to fixed rules, the qualifications of the young men who may from time to time, be proposed to be appointed to the junior situations in her Majesty's civil establishments." Accordingly Sir Edward Ryan, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, and Mr. Romilly were appointed as Commissioners for conducting the examination of the young men so proposed, with powers subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the Treasury, to appoint from time to time such assistant examiners and others, as may be required to assist them in the performance of the duties assigned to them. After a few months, Mr. Romilly resigned his office, and the conduct of the civil service examinations has subsequently devolved solely on Sir Edward Ryan and Mr. Lefevre, to whom we are indebted for the Report before us. It would, we believe, have been impossible to entrust to better hands the

important but invidious task which these gentlemen have undertaken. They have performed it, in the midst of complaint and detraction, with fearless uprightness and masterly ability; they have produced a Report which forces conviction on every reader, and which for its clearness, candour, and completeness, may well be taken as a model for similar parliamentary papers; and they have laid the foundations of a system of reform in the official administration of this country, the prospective benefits of which are incalculable.

Their duties were prescribed in the following terms:—

“1st. To ascertain that the candidate is within the limits of age prescribed in the department to which he desires to be admitted.

“2nd. To ascertain that the candidate is free from any physical defect or disease which would be likely to interfere with the proper discharge of his duties.

“3rd. To ascertain that the character of the candidate is such as to qualify him for public employment; and,

“4th. To ascertain that the candidate possesses the requisite knowledge and ability for the proper discharge of his official duties.”

This scheme was accompanied by the following provision:—

“After the candidate has passed his examination, and received his certificate of qualification from the Commissioners, he shall enter on a period of probation, during which his conduct and capacity in the transaction of business shall be subjected to such tests as may be determined by the chief of the department for which he is intended; and he shall not be finally appointed to the public service unless upon satisfactory proofs of his fitness being furnished to the chief of the department after six months’ probation.”

As the most bitter complaints have been made of the unnecessary strictness of the examinations already conducted we will briefly state the course that has been pursued by the Commissioners. They first, in conformity with their instructions, placed themselves in communication with the heads of the several departments, and ascertained from them the subjects in which they thought it most expedient that candidates in their respective departments should be examined. The result is thus stated in the Report:—

“Good handwriting, correct spelling, and some knowledge of arithmetic, usually including vulgar and decimal fractions, are requirements which every department, almost without exception, has deemed to be necessary.

“And with respect to candidates for clerkships or other analogous situations, most departments have, in addition to the before-mentioned subjects, required the power of making an abstract or précis of correspondence or official papers, and some acquaintance with English composition.

“When the business of a department has been mainly of a financial character, book-keeping, either by single or double entry, has been included amongst the necessary qualifications of a candidate.

“Other subjects have likewise been prescribed by some departments, which have less direct relation to the business to be transacted, but which test the general intelligence and education of the candidates; amongst them are the outlines of history, geography, Latin, or as an alternative some foreign language, either previously defined or left to the option of the candidate.”

Those who except against such a scheme of examination as unduly severe, must have rather singular notions of the demands of the public service, and of the class of persons to whom the subordinate and practical working of the mechanism of the state should be entrusted. To us, it appears to limit its demands to so low a grade of qualification, that to descend still lower, would be to make the examination a farce, and the method of introduction to the civil service, no better than that corrupt system of indiscriminate nomination, of the wretched results of which the public are beginning to be painfully sensible.

With respect to the results of these examinations thus far, the *Times* of the 13th ultimo, supplies the following abstract: The total number of nominees examined from the 20th of June last, to the 4th of March (the date of the Report), is 1,078; the number who received certificates, 676; the number rejected, 309;—so that we are at once justified in concluding that one person out of every three of those nominated to the public service by the present system of favouritism is unfit for the service. The number of rejections of persons unable to pass in arithmetic is no less than 89, of whom 13 failed in arithmetic alone, 33 in arithmetic and spelling, and 10 in arithmetic, spelling, and writing. The number deficient in spelling alone was 41; 23 were rejected for deficiencies in spelling and writing; 27 for deficiencies in spelling and arithmetic; and 72 for deficiencies in spelling combined with other faults;—so that out of the whole number of rejected candidates—309;—upwards of 250 were rejected for gross ignorance of these two elementary branches of knowledge, 25 were rejected for ignorance in languages, 3 for ignorance of book-keeping, and 23 for ignorance in geography. Of the kind of qualifications which have been hitherto deemed sufficient for the service of the public, a good idea may be formed by glancing over the 29th, 30th, and 31st pages of the appendix; and in doing so, we should recollect that the persons under examination, are not of an inferior class to those who have been ordinarily nominated up to this date and appointed *of course* to posts in government offices. In the pages before us, we find in detail the mistakes in orthography of 61 of the rejected can-

didates. Nothing is more common than the substitution of *there* for *their*, as for *has*, where for *were*, *to* for *too*, and *vice versa*. We have *veus*, *vains* (veins), *yolk* (yoke), *strickly*, *enequity* (equity), *sutch*, and hundreds of similar blunders. Now, let it be remembered that persons of this amount of education, have heretofore, and under ministers of every party, been smuggled into every department of the civil service. The inference is unavoidable: namely, that one-third of the present junior and subordinate servants of the government are totally incapable of performing their duties. Of the justice of this conclusion we have no doubt, But recently the writer of these pages was requested to give to a young gentleman of highly respectable family, and a clerk in the Admiralty, an examination preparatory to that of the Commissioners, with a view to his promotion to a higher class in the service. He was more frequently wrong than right in spelling the most ordinary words of one syllable, and was utterly unable to specify the quarters of the globe to which such countries as Italy, India, and Canada belonged! It will further be borne in mind, that the injury suffered by the country through such appointments, is by no means to be measured by the guage of a profligate expenditure of revenue on persons who, even supposing them to be diligent, are only qualified for menial service. The detriment incurred through their errors, neglects, and misdeeds, is doubtless incomparably greater than the loss sustained by the perversion of public funds.

The evil then appears to have arisen to an intolerable and even an incredible height. The great question for public consideration is,—How may it be best remedied? And in entertaining this inquiry, it is important to comprehend clearly that very much depends on the initial movements of the legislature, and the Commissioners. The progress of general public business cannot be incessantly interrupted for the consideration of a single matter of detail, however important,—especially, one in which private and personal feelings are so intimately involved. The questions thus opened, are the following: I. How are candidates to obtain access to the chambers of the commission which constitute the vestibule of the public service? II. What is the nature of the examination to which they should be subjected? and, III. From what class should the examiners be selected? These inquiries we propose briefly to pursue.

I. Hitherto these candidates have been simply nominees of ministers, or of their principal agent, the patronage secretary of the Treasury. The 1,078 persons who have been examined by the Commissioners, and one-third of whom have been rejected, would but for that examination have been at this moment discharging, after their manner, the varied duties

of the offices to which they aspired. In a word, the system of nomination has proved a conspicuous failure. How then is this evil to be remedied? We reply, by an open competitive examination, and by that only. The amount of buried talent, buried education, buried earnestness, buried industry in this country is perfectly enormous. The narrow door of patronage excludes ninety-nine hundredths of the *matériel* existing in the nation, and available for the public service. Why should all this public capital be buried and wasted? The refusal of the method, which at present prevails, would, as has been previously hinted in the first place, diminish bribery at elections: a venal vote may as well, and far more conveniently, be bought by a promise, as by a bank note; while the former method of bribery is far less easy of detection than the latter. To abolish, therefore, the system of appointment by government nomination, and to throw the situations under the civil service open to competition, would be to pass a subsidiary reform bill in so far as the purity of election is concerned; but, on the other hand, the purity of the House of Commons would be no less secured by the same arrangement. Has the reader ever seen that sleek and courteous gentleman, the patronage secretary of the Treasury, moving with the noiseless tread of a master of the ceremonies about the lobby and apartments of the House of Commons, greeting with both hands one member, and throwing his head on one side with thoughtful dubiousness to another, or buzzing about among the clubs with the same variety of gesture and expression? He is a gentleman at all points. He is what may be vulgarly called cadging for votes: a simple method of political swindling. He is practising on the stupidity of elderly country members, and on the inexperience of the young and adventurous. It is thus that houses are made and unmade. It is thus that majorities and minorities are concocted, both at the hustings and at the division; and it is thus that the Treasury, the Admiralty, the Horse Guards, the Ordnance, the Customs, and the Excise, and all the other departments of the state, are filled with persons who are utterly unfit for these, or any other positions which require industry or intelligence. We say again, let scope be given for the employment of the administrative talent which lies buried in that portion of the community which is excluded from interest, and which is inaccessible to a bribe. A universal competitive examination appears to us to be the only remedy for the evil.

Some ministers who have held office under the present administration, appear to have been partially prepared to act upon this principle. And we will now present their expressed opinions on this all-important subject. We have before us, in this

Report, the recorded judgment of the late Sir William Molesworth, as to the nature of the examinations which should be instituted in his own department, that is, the Colonial department. The Commissioners say,—

“After inviting our assistance to form a scheme of rules establishing tests of intellectual fitness, he proceeds thus:—

“These rules ought, undoubtedly, to be such as to secure a considerable degree of natural talent and educational attainment in every gentleman sent out, considering the great importance of the duties which are entrusted to the members of this service. But we must not proceed as if we were in search of the endowments which qualify for imaginative or speculative authorship. What we want is the practical ability and information which is appropriate to the superintendence of public affairs, and the transaction of public business. I am, therefore, anxious that the scale of subjects and tests which you are to suggest, while, of course, comprising the leading features of a liberal education, should be given, as far as possible, a practical character.”

On the premature death of Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Labouchere succeeded to the Secretaryship of the Colonial department, and transmitted to the Civil Service Commissioners some more explicit opinions as to the nature of the examinations which should be conducted in his branch of the service. Mr. Labouchere's statements are so closely relevant to this subject, that we will give them *in extenso*.

“A sound, and, if possible, a quick and versatile judgment, a mind trained to reasoning, retentiveness of memory, facility and accuracy of composition, a good knowledge of modern history and geography, and some knowledge of the elementary principles of law and jurisprudence, especially constitutional,—these are among the qualities, natural and acquired, which may be said to be most frequently in requisition here, and which it is very desirable to ensure, as far as this can be effected, by the test of previous examination. To these may be added a knowledge of the most generally diffused modern languages, not as of the same essential importance here as perhaps in some other departments, but still as valuable both directly for occasional use, and indirectly from the extensive range of knowledge which it opens to its possessor; and knowledge of figures and accounts, for which there is very frequent use; and lastly, classical acquirement, not of course as in itself often available, but from the test which it affords of early habits of application, and from its tendency to aid in mental development. Mr. Labouchere would also suggest, that, for the purposes of this department, great ability in one particular line should every now and then be received as a compensation for deficiency in others, as by a division of labour such special talents may easily be made available.

“It is Mr. Labouchere's opinion, that whatever may be the value

of an examination by way of test, if conducted by able and experienced hands, for eliciting proof of qualities such as these, yet a far greater and more effective security will be afforded by examinations conducted to a certain extent on the competitive principle.

“But it is essential to bear in mind one consideration, which it may be feared rather adds to than diminishes the difficulty of dealing with the subject. Although the above description of the qualities required in the higher departments of this office is in no degree exaggerated, it is nevertheless true, to revert again to the opinion expressed in the Report already cited, that the ‘official education’ which occupies generally the first years of a clerk’s employment (more or less according to circumstances over which the clerk himself can have but little control), must partake, in a great degree, of a mechanical character. Something has been done, since that Report appeared, towards carrying out its recommendations, that this class of business should be entrusted to copyists and others not on the establishment. Nevertheless it remains the case, and must in Mr. Labouchere’s opinion so remain, that a large proportion of work, of little more than routine order, cannot be properly performed except by the regular clerks.

“It may, therefore, be a considerable time before the higher qualities of which I have spoken are put seriously in requisition in each case, and in the meantime another order of qualities is required, not always found in combination with them. Mechanical accuracy, habits of carefulness, a ready and precise memory of details, punctuality and neatness in the discharge of minutiae, a readiness to take interest in comparatively uninteresting work, that gentlemanly spirit which prompts at once to co-operation with superiors and subordination to them,—these and such as these, are the qualities which in the Colonial Office, as elsewhere, are most commonly called into use during the earlier part of a clerk’s employment.

“The conclusions which Mr. Labouchere draws from these various, and to a certain extent conflicting, considerations, are the following:—

“That the preliminary examination should be so directed as to draw out as far as possible the latter as well as the former class of qualities, a problem of which he recognizes the difficulty, and can only leave it to the practised experience of the members of the Civil Service Commission.

“That whatever may be the character and acquirements of those who may succeed in the examination, the year of probation, at present required, ought by no means to be dispensed with.

“Further, Mr. Labouchere believes that a system of open competition, under which duties, such as above described, should be simply entrusted, without other guarantee, to the performance of the cleverest and most ambitious youths, would be at least of doubtful advantage for the purposes of this department. Mr. Labouchere, however, does not wish to enter on this important general question further than is necessary to explain his intentions. For the present he means to place on his list of candidates for the office a certain limited number of young men, of whose character and qualifications

he may have had reason to form a favourable opinion. When a vacancy in the establishment occurs, it is his design to leave it open for the competition of his list, leaving the decision between them to the Commissioners, if they do not object to this demand on their time and services. It would, of course, be open to the Commissioners to combine the system of competition with that of test, and to report, if such were their opinion, that no candidate before them was fit for selection."

Before proceeding to an examination of Mr. Labouchere's official statement, or we might rather say in substitution of such a criticism, we will present the reasoning of the Editor of the *Times* upon the report before us, to which we give our cordial consent. His first observation is as follows:—

"The Commission has also conducted a number of competitive examinations for no less than 58 situations, for which 175 candidates have been examined; and they record an emphatic opinion that the candidates selected on these occasions are very superior to those who have succeeded in passing the ordinary examinations. They then proceed to lay before the public the inferences they have drawn from their experience in examination.

* * * * *

"We desire to draw no strained inferences from this Report, but it would be impossible to deny that it establishes some conclusions of the very gravest nature with reference to the public service, and the present education of the middle and upper classes. The first is, that the power possessed by ministers of state of appointing persons to situations has been abused to a degree which nothing but the most undoubted testimony could have led us to believe possible. That one person out of three should have been rejected altogether, and that the standard should be kept injuriously low in order that the public service might not be damaged by a paucity of appointments, are facts which those who met the aspersions cast on the civil service with a general laudation, will find it impossible to get over. The second inference is not a very satisfactory estimate of the efficiency of a service every third member of which ought, it appears, on no overstrained estimate of proficiency, to have been rejected altogether. A third, is as to the disgraceful state of the education which produces such fruits. A fourth inference is that the matter cannot be allowed to rest here, and that, while there are in the country innumerable young men of talent and good education, able to satisfy the requirements of the public service, it is monstrous to lower the standard of writing and spelling in order that the public service may not suffer by the rejection of too many of those incompetent persons to whom these appointments are confined. If so many of the clerks we get even under the present system are bad, and if, as the Commissioners say, competition secures a much higher rate of attainment, on what principle will government justify the filling these offices with worse men when better are to be had, and withholding from the great body

of the nation the entrance to its own service, in order to lavish patronage on idleness, ignorance, and inefficiency?"

In the next impression of the *Times* (March 14th), we find the following observations in a second leading article on the Report:—

"It appears that the most important deficiencies have been found in simple spelling, but in connexion with this must be mentioned another defect, which has been strongly felt in all the candidates more or less, but on which the examiners have not insisted as a test. The power of writing out an abstract or *précis* of official papers or correspondence is essential in many departments of the public service. In few ways can a clerk be more useful to his superior in office than in presenting him with a concise, correct, and clear abridgment of documents, and it is unfortunately not yet a part of general education to teach this happy art. In the present report there are many examples of what is wanted in this way—acts of parliament to be abridged, a correspondence to be summed up in a few sentences, documents to be drawn up from a slight brief, letters to be answered from one or two minutes endorsed on them,—all requiring a clear head, and such practice in composition as is not always afforded in public schools. When these requirements are more generally known it may be presumed that the candidates will be more qualified to undergo a severe test as to this kind of excellence; and every year, indeed, we may perhaps expect that the examinations will become—at least they ought to become—more strict.

"Besides the qualifications of candidates, on which the present report gives the most satisfactory information, there is another subject on which the report says very little. It will be understood that these appointments are not made by open competition. The candidates undergo merely a pass examination, and the question arises—Ought this system to be maintained? Mr. Labouchere proposes, indeed, that it should be partly abolished, and that a system of limited competition should be adopted; in other words, that, instead of nominating one candidate for one office, a number should be nominated, and the best should win. We cannot help thinking that, if there is to be a competition at all, it should be perfectly open. The only defence of the present nomination which exists is that the patron is sure of the moral character and gentlemanly bearing of his nominee. Let that defence pass for what it is worth—we say nothing against it; but the moment the principle is introduced of naming several candidates, instead of selecting one, the chief value of the old system is gone, and the competition might as well be thrown entirely open to the public. There is all the difference in the world between the head of a department selecting a single candidate to fill a particular appointment, and his picking out a dozen or half-a-dozen to fight for it. In the one case there is the responsibility of selection, and perhaps attachment to his choice; in the other there is little choice, and no responsibility."

Mr. Labouchere is evidently verging towards the right and only course, but what does he mean by a partially competitive examination? We cannot conceive that the line to be drawn can be otherwise than arbitrary; and we, therefore, encourage the hope that the commissioners will be empowered to throw open the appointments under the civil service to universal competition, and that they will henceforth be responsible to parliament, and not to the crown under an order in council.

II. As to the nature of the examinations, the first requisite obviously is, that the attainments of the candidates should be suited to the nature of the situations which they propose to fill. The majority of these are of a very humble kind, and the examination should, in all justice, be proportioned to these qualifications; and even in the higher departments, great experience in examination is required, in order to test the qualifications of the candidates. In elementary subjects they cannot be too severe, but in classics and mathematics many may be rejected who might be most useful to the public service. That these subjects are important as general tests is not to be denied. They may be fairly taken as the guages of early education; but an intelligent examiner, well acquainted with the requisitions of the public service, will not put the ability to solve an equation, or to demonstrate a given proposition of Euclid, before that of writing a concise, but comprehensive abstract, or a clear, grammatical, and elegant letter.

III. We come, thirdly, to the important inquiry as to the class from which the examiners should be selected, and here we have no hesitation in pronouncing our opinion. In one word, they should be men who, in the first place, have been accustomed to teach and to examine; and, secondly, who have been habituated to teach and examine that class of persons who are proposed, or who may propose themselves, for appointments under the civil service of the crown. And we here are compelled to take a most grave exception against the arrangements of the Civil Service Commissioners, whose general scheme, and whose intelligent perception of their important functions, we have so strongly commended. It is with extreme regret that we have observed that all the examiners whom they have appointed, both permanent and occasional, are graduates of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

We are the more surprised at this, inasmuch as one of the Commissioners is the Chancellor of the University of London, and the other is one of the most active and influential members of the council of University College. The effect of these appointments will be manifest to any practised examiner who inspects the appendices to the report. Many of the questions

are unexceptionable, but a large number of them show that the gentlemen employed have been accustomed to examine, not for those practical purposes which Sir William Molesworth so wisely indicated, but rather for university honours. We cannot but think that many of the Latin passages are very ill-chosen, requiring, as they appear to us to do, an amount of recondite scholarship which is quite unnecessary for the purposes of the public service. In university examinations they would be perfectly appropriate, but for the civil service we cannot but think that they are ill-adapted and superfluous.

These considerations naturally lead us to some further remarks on these appointments. The first is, as just intimated, that the gentlemen appointed have not, in all probability, been accustomed to teaching and examining upon those branches of education which are most useful in the junior departments of the civil service; but our second objection is one which we most earnestly commend to the consideration of the Commissioners. Every examiner which they have appointed is a member of one of the two Universities of Oxford or Cambridge. Hence, every examiner is a member of the Church of England; and as would appear from the present system of appointment, all other persons, however high their qualifications, are absolutely excluded. This system of exclusion is in total opposition to the liberal spirit of the age, out of which spirit all real reforms must necessarily spring. The Royal Commissioners are *ex officio* reformers, and we implore them not to mar the high function committed to them by the adoption of an exclusive and sectarian principle. A university degree confers no recommendation which cannot be equalled by proofs of competency which may be presented by the most highly qualified men, who could not conscientiously take that honour; and if these pages should reach the eye of Her Majesty's Commissioners, we respectfully urge upon them not to vitiate the grand reform which they are initiating, by complying with a system which has been the pregnant source of inefficiency and mal-administration, by repudiating those liberal principles in which all useful reforms have their origin, and by entombing one-half of the talent, the intelligence, and the capacity for the public service which exists among their countrymen.

Brief Notices.

Glimpses of Jesus ; or, Christ exalted in the Affections of His People.
By W. P. Balforn. Second Edition. London: John Farquhar Shaw.

A BOOK is a good book, if, while it embodies right principles, it presents them in a manner attractive to any considerable class of readers. In this sense we can truthfully commend the volume before us. It consists of meditations on some of the most remarkable events in the life of the Saviour, and being written in an animated style, abounding in metaphors often striking and happy, will, we think, prove an acceptable book to many. For circulation amongst persons whose leisure for reading is limited, and by whom a few valuable thoughts expressed in a novel and easily to be remembered manner, are better appreciated than trains of close thinking, these "glimpses" are especially suited. We find, occasionally, great point in the writer's mode of putting an argument. For instance, the chapter entitled "Jesus in the Synagogue, or a word to the National Religionist," is very striking, and we could wish to see it printed as a separate tract for distribution at the present juncture.

Echoes of the Universe. From the World of Matter and the World of Spirit. By Henry Christmas, M.A., F.R.S., &c., &c.

THIS is a work useful in its tendency, sound in its views, and, for the most part, just in its reasonings and conclusions. It is one of those works which have, for some time, been appearing before the public,—works called for by the character of the age in which we live, and rendered necessary by the philosophy, falsely so called, which is but too prevalent at the present time. The writer ranges through the most interesting topics taken from the worlds of matter and of mind; in the former, Astronomy, Light, Geology, and Cosmography; and in the latter, the Personality of the Deity, Divine Appearances under the Law, Angels, Demoniack Possessions, the Immortality of the soul, and other cognate subjects. The matter contained in this volume was first delivered in the form of lectures to the members of a branch of the Young Men's Society for promoting Missions at Home and Abroad, and is, therefore, popular, and somewhat superficial in its character. Though there is a natural disinclination in the mind to the didactic, whether in matter or manner, yet, unless a subject is treated with sufficient speciality and minuteness, it will be unsatisfactory even to the class for whom it is designed. This remark will apply to some parts of this volume. The doctrine of the eternity of matter is dismissed in a way not calculated to satisfy a mind which has any doubts on the subject, that is, by a simple reference to

Gen. i. 1.: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," compared with, and explained by, Heb. xi. 3: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do (did) appear." The citation of these passages, the writer observes, must set the question at rest. We should say so too, if he had shown that they contained the orthodox doctrine of the creation of matter, but this he fails to do. The creation of heaven and earth *may* mean nothing more than their formation out of preceding materials. And the expression "not made out of things which did appear," may refer to Gen. i. 3, where it is said, "Darkness was on the face of the deep." If darkness was on the face of the deep, then the world was formed out of things that did *not* appear. Now, we do not say that this is the meaning, but surely it behoved the writer by a proper exegesis of the passage, to have shown that his doctrine was really contained in this portion of Scripture. There are other things to which we might object. We do not approve of such language as that we find in page 194, where it is said that "Christ is a part of God." Such language explains nothing, teaches nothing, and were much better avoided.* Nor do we think it is proper to say that "when God set a mark upon Cain he made a covenant with him" (p. 196). Some divines have thought it probable that the benefits of the death of Christ may extend to the whole universe of rational minds, but have expressed themselves with becoming reserve and modesty on the subject. Our lecturer, however, is much more bold, and declares that there is not one corner of this vast expanse (the expanse of the creation) where the merits of Christ's passion and the consequences of his death are not felt. However pleasing such sentiments may be, the reader expects, at least, to see them sustained by probable evidence. In another place, he tells us "that revelation teaches the immortality of the soul." It behoved him to have shown where and how it gives such teaching. The declaration that the gospel "has brought life and immortality to light," he must be aware, will not be considered as proving the point. Immortality may be the fruit of Christ's death, and may be enjoyed by all believers without being an original condition of the human mind. Again, his philosophical argument for the immortality of the soul is open to objection. He founds it upon the soul's immateriality—the latter being taken for granted. Had this point been first proved, the argument would have been more conclusive. "The soul," says he, "having no elements into which it may be resolved, must remain in its original condition." But the reader would wish to see it demonstrated that it *has* no elements. We believe that this has been shown, but surely not by our lecturer. However, notwithstanding these remarks, and others of a similar kind which we might make, we can cordially recommend the work on account of its spirit and tone, and the variety of valuable information which it conveys.

* This, however, is not Mr. Christmas's own language, but occurs in a quotation from Slack's "Church of the Future."—ED.

Lights and Shadows of Spiritual Life. By Henry Welsford. With an Introduction by the Rev. George Redford, DD., LL.D. London: Snow.

WE regard this as a thoroughly excellent and valuable book, the work of one to whom religion is indeed a vital thing, we should say *the* vital thing; and the author brings to his subject, not merely an earnest mind, but one rich in the results of experience and thoughtful observation. In the delineation of various classes of character involved in the scope of the work, the writer is peculiarly happy. The power of discrimination displayed is great, and while the announcement of Christian truth is uncompromising, the total absence of everything like extravagance in thought or expression, leaves no room for even the least candid of the opponents of religion to cavil. We hope that this volume will obtain a large circulation. As a gift to those who have begun to look on life as an earnest thing, and who need thoughtful guidance in religious truth, we think few books could be more suitable; while those, also, who are advanced in life will find in it much matter for wise consideration, and will do well to hold intercourse with a writer who so evidently speaks of the things which he has known and felt.

Life in Jesus: a Memoir of Mrs. Mary Winslow; arranged from her Correspondence, Diary, and Thoughts. By her son, Octavius Winslow, D.D. Pp. 503. London: J. F. Shaw. 1856.

WE have often uttered our protest in the pages of this Journal against the daily increasing evil of obtruding upon the reading community the biographies of persons who occupied a private station in life. That evil has reached so great a height in the present day that we may reasonably expect a reaction against it, and we are inclined to believe that the time is near at hand when many of these memorials of devout persons, whose names and worth were known during life only to a small circle of friends and admirers, will be consigned to "the tomb of all the Capulets," the dreary limbo of unsaleable and unreadable books. Neither literature nor religion can receive any considerable detriment from these often hasty and ill-advised effusions; just as the glories of mediæval and modern art suffer no depreciation from the multitude of gaudy pictures which every season produces. The sad result of these memoirs is, that oftentimes a weak and sentimental religion is exhibited for the popular approval and imitation, as if any persons leading a reckless and evil life could be allured to better habitudes by reading the self-laudatory diaries and the wordy biographies of those whose names, in many cases, have been known to the public only since their departure from the world, and whose practical goodness was restricted to a very small sphere. Mankind with one accord raise statues and memorial piles to their statesmen and heroes; but we are not as yet prepared, notwithstanding all our economical and military reforms,

to vote these honours to clerks and subalterns, however admirably these may have fulfilled their duty.

As regards the handsome volume now before us, we have to remark that it contains the biography of an accomplished and eminently pious lady, compiled from various letters and family papers by her son, who is well known as the author of numerous works, which have had an extensive sale among a considerable section of the religious public. Beautifully got up, and not uninteresting in its details, it will be an acceptable book to many who have perused Dr. Winslow's previous publications. The volume, however, is too large; some of the letters and reflections which are published in it might profitably have been omitted, and the work would have gained in value what it lost in bulk. There is a redundancy of epithet and metaphor here and there, which, if allowable in a popular discourse, are not suitable to an elaborate and carefully written historical memorial. These trifling blemishes, however,—for such many persons will deem them—the worthy writer may readily remove when a second edition may be called for.

"The son of parents passed into the skies" will ever find it a delicate and difficult task to present to the world a faithful portrait of his departed kindred; and in the present instance, Dr. Winslow has endeavoured to give a handsome and affectionate tribute to the memory of a lady whose character was worthy of all imitation, and whose friends were neither few nor inconsiderable. That this memoir may be of utility to many persons, whose religion hitherto has been a tender sentiment rather than the grand and unfailing business of life, we do not doubt; and while our criticism has reference principally to the colouring and finish of the picture, we hope that the eminent goodness recorded in these pages may produce in many minds the earnest longing after the attainment and daily practice of that true virtue which Christianity alone inculcates. The truly good are so few in this changing world of ours, that the departure of any of them must be a cause for grief to those survivors to whom they were endeared; but we cannot acquaint ourselves with the records of their lives without a thankful joy "that such as these have lived and died." Among these, the good and noble of the earth, may justly be ranked this excellent lady, the story of whose life has been feelingly written by her son.

The Works of the Right Hon. Joseph Addison, with Notes by Richard Hurd, D.D., late Bishop of Worcester. A New Edition, with Large Additions, chiefly unpublished; collected and edited by Henry G. Bohn. 6 vols. Bohn.

THIS is, on more accounts than one, a highly valuable work. It presents, in the first place, all the writings of this justly admired author, at a singularly small cost, and yet in an elegant typographical form. As the latest, it may be assumed to be the purest text; and, as a crowning advantage, it contains, though at so late a date, about

a hundred letters of Addison, which have never before been printed. These unexpected memorials, while they possess comparatively little of intrinsic value, are acceptable as a literary curiosity. Nothing, indeed, can be devoid of interest which is in any way related to such a man. For some editorial defects Mr. Bohn feels it necessary to apologize, and perhaps the most candid critic must admit that these volumes would have been far more worthy of praise had they been produced under the hands of some one with whom literature is the main occupation of life, rather than of a gentleman whose attention must be so largely devoted to the claims of an extensive business.

Russia; its Rise and Progress, Tragedies and Revolutions. By the Rev. Thomas Milner, M.A., F.R.G.S. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 1856.

THIS is the former of two volumes, of which the second, to be entitled "Nicholas and the Caucasus: the Mountains, the Tribes, and the Wars," will be devoted to the reign of the late Czar, and complete a general view of the history and policy of Russia. The volume before us commences with the introduction of Christianity into the Russian territory in the middle of the ninth century; and is continued to the accession of the late Emperor Nicholas in 1825. It is a heart-sickening history of barbarism, superstition, and cruelty, and suggests the necessary connexion between a false religion and a despotic government. No race of mankind could have tolerated the brutal administration of the Emperors of Russia whose souls had not been debased by embracing a hideous caricature of Christianity. The only retribution which could be visited on the oppressors in such a state of society is the wild justice of revenge. Accordingly assassination has generally done that work which should have been undertaken by the most solemn tribunals of justice; and where this has been effected by the less obvious agency of poison, the dying tyrant has generally manifested a horrible consciousness that he is not obeying "kind nature's signal to retreat." Even in the absence of evidence, there seems, in some cases, to have existed a dark suspicion to embitter the hour of death. The writer thus describes the end of the Emperor Alexander: "He had been ill at intervals during the whole tour, and left the Crimea, suffering from its intermittent fever, which had a fatal termination, December 1st. From first to last he refused to take medicine, trusting for recovery to the vigour of his constitution, and, perhaps, influenced by the predestinarian views he was known to entertain. 'My friend,' said he to Sir James Wylie, his physician, who constantly attended him, 'it is the state of my nerves to which you must attend: they are in frightful disorder.' 'Alas,' rejoined the physician, 'that happens more frequently to kings than to ordinary men.' 'Yes,' said the Emperor, with animation, 'but with me, in particular, there are many special reasons, and, at the present hour, more so than ever.' Some days afterwards, when his brain was almost delirious, the Czar gazed intently on the doctor,

his whole countenance manifesting intense fear. 'Oh, my friend,' he exclaimed, 'what an act, what a horrible act! The monsters! the ungrateful monsters! I designed nothing but their happiness.'"
—Pp. 493, 494.

Theological Essays reprinted from the Princeton Review. With a Preface by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, D.D.

THE essays of which this volume is composed are extracted from an American journal of eminence, and are from the pens of some of the ablest divines on the other side of the Atlantic; they are here reprinted for the benefit of the English scholar, and will abundantly reward the labour of perusal. We have essays on "The Decrees of God," "Original Sin," "The Doctrine of Imputation," "The Power of Contrary Choice," "The Inability of Sinners," "The New Divinity Tried," "Beman on the Atonement," and "Regeneration." To these are added some on several points of the Popish Controversy, and two or three on the errors of the German Philosophy and Pantheism. One of these, the essay on Transcendentalism, is a very masterly production, and calculated to be useful at the present time among our young divines, both by the clear exposition which it gives of the authors and subjects treated of, and by the solemn protest which it enters against the most dangerous heresies of the times. The philosophies of Kant, of Fichte, of Schelling, and Hegel are clearly explained, and the dark atheism to which they lead faithfully portrayed. Among the essays we would direct the attention of the young student and others anxious for correct information on these points to this, as an able refutation of the theories to which it refers.

Review of the Month.

THE DEBATE ON SIR WILLIAM CLAY'S MOTION ON CHURCH-RATES, HAS ISSUED IN THE SIGNAL TRIUMPH OF THE FRIENDS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. In presenting a view of the present position of this question in parliament we shall adopt the concise statement put forth by the Liberation of Religion Society: "The Church-Rate Abolition Party succeeded in carrying the second reading of Sir William Clay's bill, on the 5th March, by a majority of forty-three. It is a significant circumstance that although about the same number of members (four hundred) voted in 1854, 1855, and 1856, the opponents of church-rates have each year increased their

majority, and, as no less than eighty-seven liberal members were absent on the 5th ult., they calculate on a still further increase, while the supporters of church-rates have, it is believed, brought out their utmost strength. On this last occasion the government, as such, voted for the bill, instead of leaving it an open question as heretofore; reserving to themselves, however, the right of proposing some material alterations in committee. These have since been published, and their character, as well as the view taken of them by the leaders of the abolitionists, may be learned from the following resolutions on the subject, passed by the executive committee of the Liberation of Religion Society. 'That this committee, retaining the conviction, that the entire repeal of the law of church-rates would be most consistent with sound policy, and conducive to the interests of religion, is earnestly desirous that the bill introduced for that purpose should receive the sanction of legislature. That having examined the amendments in such bill, of which notice has been given by the Home Secretary, it finds that they, in effect, entirely abolish church-rates in a large number of parishes—give power to other parishes to retain or to abolish them, at their discretion—and, where rates may continue to be levied, exempt from payment all who may think fit to declare themselves not to be members of the Church of England. That as these provisions are in harmony with, though falling short of, the object aimed at by this committee, and do not preclude further proceedings for securing its complete realization, the committee deems it expedient to support the government in its efforts to carry the bill, as so amended, through both houses of parliament. That in arriving at such determination, this committee holds itself at liberty, in the event of the rejection of the measure, as so modified, to take any steps for giving complete effect to the principle already affirmed by successive and increasing majorities of the House of Commons.' The 30th of April is fixed for going into committee on the bill, but determined opposition will again be offered to it at that stage." The debate, which was long and excited, indicated all that ignorance of the principles of religious liberty, which is engendered by the habitual recognition of a state-established church, but the self-exposure of Lord John Russell was perfectly lamentable. The kernel of the noble lord's speech in opposition to the motion will be found in the following passage: "I conceive that the case as it stands at present is this—Here is an ancient law, declared to be so by the most eminent judges of the land, which imposes on each parish the legal obligation of repairing the fabric of the parish church, and providing for the celebration of divine worship in that church. Chief Justice Tindal and Lord Truro, among other learned judges, have maintained that this legal obligation exists; but they have said at the same time that it is an obligation which could not be enforced against the will of a majority of the parishioners. They have asserted, not that the obligation ceased or that the law was abrogated, but that the obligation is one that can be evaded. Well, it appears to me that the persons who have a grievance on this subject are, in fact, the members of the

established church (cheers from the opposition); because they may say—Here is an ancient law imposing an obligation, which was confessedly intended for and necessary to the sustentation of the established church, but that obligation cannot be enforced. Some persons may say, as my right hon. friend has said to-night—‘If we were to attempt to give force and validity to the law, and to compel persons to fulfil the obligation, which great judges have said attaches to them, we should disturb the peace of the country, we should create a great deal of ill-feeling, and we should provoke hostility to the church itself.’ I think the church may fairly answer, ‘That is a question for ministers of state; we accept your allegation; we are willing to acquiesce in what you say; we will not attempt to enforce obligations, which, in your opinion, might affect the peace of the community; but do tell us in what other way you propose to provide for the maintenance of the church.’” Need we suggest the reply to Lord John’s hypothetical theory. How are those places of worship sustained which weekly accommodate the majority of worshippers in this country? By voluntary contribution. Yet these edifices do not fall into decay, though the wealth of their attendants is not to be compared with that of the established church. If the state establishment, as such, has so utterly lost the respect of its members that they do not care to preserve its places of worship, the sooner it is abolished the better for the peace of the country and the credit of Christianity. Antiquity so far from sanctioning a political abuse, is like the lapse of time during which a tumour in the body has grown unnoticed. In both cases the necessity for a total excision is proportionate to the duration of the evil.

THE QUESTION OF NATIONAL EDUCATION HAS AGAIN BEEN THROWN, LIKE THE APPLE OF DISCORD, INTO OUR MIDST. The measure now before Parliament is the offspring of Lord John Russell. His motion was made on the 6th of March, and embodied the following resolutions: “1. That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to extend, revise, and consolidate the minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education. 2. That it is expedient to add to the present inspectors of church schools eighty sub-inspectors, and to divide England and Wales into eighty divisions for the purposes of education. 3. That it is expedient to appoint sub-inspectors of British, Wesleyan, and other Protestant schools not connected with the Church, and also of Roman Catholic schools, according to the present proportions of inspectors of such schools to the inspectors of church schools. 4. That on the report of the inspectors and sub-inspectors the Committee of Privy Council should have power to form in each division school districts, consisting of single or united parishes, or parts of parishes. 5. That the sub-inspectors of schools of each division should be instructed to report on the available means for the education of the poor in each school district. 6. That, for the purpose of extending such means, it is expedient that the powers at present possessed by the Commissioners of Charitable Trusts be enlarged, and that funds now useless or injurious to the community, be applied to the education of the middle and

poorer classes of the community. 7. That it is expedient, that in any school district where the means of education, arising from endowment, subscription, grants, and school pence shall be found deficient, and shall be declared to be so by the Committee of Privy Council for Education, the ratepayers should have the power of taxing themselves for the erection and maintenance of a school or schools. 8. That after the first day of January, 1858, when any school district shall have been declared to be deficient in adequate means for the education of the poor, the quarter sessions of the peace for the county, city, or borough should have the power to impose a school rate. 9. That where a school rate is imposed a school committee, elected by the ratepayers, should appoint the schoolmasters and mistresses, and make regulations for the management of the schools. 10. That in every school supported in whole or in part by rates, a portion of the Holy Scriptures should be read daily in the school, and such other provision should be made for religious instruction as the school committee may think fit, but that no child shall be compelled to receive any religious instruction, or attend any religious worship, to which his or her parents or guardians shall, on conscientious grounds, object. 11. That employers of children and young persons between nine and fifteen years of age, should be required to furnish certificates, half-yearly, of the attendance of such children and young persons at school, and to pay for such instruction. 12. That it is expedient that every encouragement should be given, by prizes, by diminution of school fees, by libraries, by evening schools, and other methods, to the instruction of young persons between twelve and fifteen years of age." The only organized opposition to this movement, of the existence of which we are aware, emanates from a committee represented by Mr. Samuel Morley as chairman, and the Rev. John Howard Hinton as secretary. The document which they have put forth, summoning the municipal bodies of this country to a united opposition to the proposed measure is so conclusive in its reasoning, and so comprehensive and concise in its statements, that we shall avail ourselves of the most important parts of it without further acknowledgment. The measure, as to its principal provisions, did not wholly originate with Lord John Russell, but with the government of which he is no longer a member. On the opening of the session it was announced by ministers that it was in contemplation of the crown to institute a specific department of the state under the direction of a responsible minister of education; an object for the effectuation of which a bill has been brought in, and carried through the upper house, to enable Her Majesty to appoint a vice-president of the Committee of Council on Education capable of sitting in the House of Commons. On the 14th of February, without any previous intimation, a bill "for promoting Education in England and Wales" was by the Lord President of the Council—who is also President of the Committee of Council on Education—laid on the table of the House of Lords, where it still awaits its second reading. This bill proposes to constitute the town councils in all boroughs, and an elected body of persons in all parishes, com-

missioners of education, and to empower them to "take such measures as they deem expedient for promoting education in their borough, or parish, or parishes, by establishing and maintaining, or contributing to the establishment and maintenance, of a new school or schools, or by aiding any existing school or schools, with a view to extend the benefits thereof, or by all or any of the means aforesaid, as they shall think proper." (Clause 21.) The whole expense of such proceedings is to be thrown upon the rates (not exceeding sixpence in the pound), upon the security of which money may be borrowed from the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. The bill is permissive, but may be made operative in any borough by two-thirds of a meeting of the burgesses, and in any parish by two-thirds of a meeting of ratepayers. It must be obvious, on a mere glance at the facts briefly stated above, that the measures in progress supply no unreal cause for anxiety and alarm. The proposed appointment by the crown of a minister of public instruction is evidently an advance on the composition of the Committee of Council on Education, and one by which the education of the people will be more completely than heretofore under the control of the government. As to the two schemes of education so singularly brought forward at the same moment, the one by the government itself, and the other by a private member of the House of Commons, totally unlike as they are to each other, they exhibit a common hostility to our principles and our aims. The bill of the Lord President is mainly characterized by the studied evasion of every difficult question, and throws over, without scruple or exception, all the problems which have hitherto baffled the wisdom of the legislature, into the hands of town councils and parochial commissioners—bodies of men certainly far less qualified to decide them. Nor is it possible that such questions can either be introduced into such bodies without giving rise to local dissensions and party conflicts, or be determined by them without inflicting in some cases, at least, and probably in many, serious injustice and injury. It is an aggravation of the mischiefs thus sure to ensue, that they would be without remedy, no appeal lying from the decisions of the local commissioners, as no rule is laid down for their guidance: a scheme for subjecting popular education to a thousand tyrannies instead of one. "What, then," say the committee, "becomes of the religious question? Are these schools, supported by public rates, to include any religion or none? And if any, which? Any one, or all alike—heterodox and orthodox; conformist and nonconformist; Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish? Lord John abhors the thought of schools for the poor without religion; therefore, he insists that 'the Holy Scriptures shall be daily read in the school.' What more? Nothing, absolutely nothing! He slyly adds, 'Such other provision shall be made for religious instruction as the school committee may think fit;' such school committee being probably in many parishes the clergyman and the churchwardens, and possibly in others a group of freethinkers. In truth, nothing can be more flagrantly inconsistent in itself, or a more violent outrage on the sanctity of religion, than thus at once to

acknowledge its necessity as an element of popular education, and to reduce the provision for it to a practical nonentity. This is nothing less than trifling egregiously with the religious feeling of the country, while professing to pay it respect." The committee, after enumerating the practical inconveniences which must arise under the operation of such an act, conclude their address in the following terms: "With these remarks on the parliamentary movement in relation to popular education, we submit the case to your consideration. The committee feel it to be their duty to offer to it an unqualified and strenuous resistance, as at once uncalled for and injurious. They are still parental, not state educationists. They still advocate voluntary as opposed to compulsory tuition. Their faith is unshaken, that voluntary educational activity has done much, is doing much, and will speedily do all that the country requires. They trust that you concur in these sentiments, and that you will co-operate with them in opposing the further progress of measures by which, in their judgment, the best interests of popular education are endangered. In particular, we trust you will immediately forward a petition to parliament from the congregation with which you are connected, and engage some of your friends to write in the same sense to the representatives of the place where you reside." In the wisdom and justice of these views we heartily acquiesce. We desire as cordially as any of our legislators can do, a wide extension of the opportunities of education to the lower classes; but we are suffering, in spite of the "massacre of the innocents" which takes place at the end of every session, from the evil of over-legislation. Our country, like Tarpeia, is crushed beneath the multitudinous shields of law. If it be granted that the state should provide even secular instruction of the people, the next step must be to argue that it is its duty, *a fortiori*, to provide the highest and most important of all instruction—that is religious. The voluntary system which has already achieved so much, will, under the blessing of Him who ordained it, yet show itself adequate to all the requirements of a benighted and misguided population.

AT LENGTH ALL EUROPE IS IN CONFIDENT EXPECTATION OF A SPEEDY CONCLUSION OF PEACE. Indeed, it is generally believed that this event will take place before these pages meet the eye of the reader. To the surprise of many, the King of Prussia, whose pusillanimity and double dealing throughout the progress of the war have exposed him to universal contempt, has been invited to send a representative to the Peace Conferences. The ostensible reason for this, as explained by Lord Palmerston, is that it would be necessary to reconsider and reconstruct one treaty to which Prussia was a party; but as it would have been plainly impossible to admit Prussia, who was not a party to the war, to any participation in the discussion of the cardinal points of peace, the invitation of that power was universally received as evidence that the main matters of the negotiation had been already adjusted. One only difficulty appears to remain, namely, the dissatisfaction of Turkey with the arrangements proposed by the Western Powers for the future condition

and government of the Danubian Provinces: the inhabitants themselves are opposed to the supremacy of Turkey as well as of Russia, and desire an independent constitution. The case is a complicated one, and will probably be settled as to its details after the declaration of peace. Most fortunately for the Emperor of the French, the birth of an heir-apparent to the throne coincided in time with the virtual conclusion of a peace. Hence the public rejoicings and congratulations were unmingled with those gloomy anxieties which would have been engendered by the prospect of the continuance of the war. Again, the Emperor has fallen on his feet, and doubtless anticipates that this event will constitute him the founder of a dynasty, though there is something to chill a too sanguine disposition in the fact, that should the son succeed the father on the throne, it will be for the first time that such an event has occurred in the history of France for the last two centuries. It is hoped that one of the results of our alliance with the French, and of the peace which is apparently on the eve of completion, will be at least an approximation to a reciprocal system of free trade between the two countries—an event which would constitute to both countries the best compensation for the sacrifices and calamities of the war.

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE PAST MONTH does not present any topics of unusual interest. The controversy, however, between Mr. Hepworth Dixon and Mr. Macaulay, is exciting attention in the literary world. Mr. Dixon prefers a long series of charges against the historian in reference to the character and conduct of William Penn, which have been persistively impugned by the latter. These charges so materially involve the historical reputation of Mr. Macaulay, that we think he is bound to meet them, otherwise judgment must go by default, and the reliability of Mr. Macaulay's future statements will sink materially in public estimation. Messrs. Longman have just given to the public the first two volumes of Southey's Correspondence, and Raikes' Diary from 1831 to 1847, comprising reminiscences of social and political life in London and Paris during that period. These will receive attention in the May number of the ECLECTIC. Since the issue of our last number, the controversy originated by our notice of Mr. Lynch's Sacred Poems has been waged with increasing bitterness in the columns of the *Morning Advertiser*. The editor has called on the orthodox ministry to pronounce, and their response has been a warm commendation of Mr. Lynch's volume, a hearty approval of the course adopted by the ECLECTIC REVIEW with reference to it, and an emphatic condemnation of the procedure of the *Morning Advertiser*. The editor further called on the religious portion of the newspaper press to give judgment in the case. The *Nonconformist* and the *Patriot* have done so, cordially endorsing the evangelical character of Mr. Lynch's poems, and visiting the editor of the *Morning Advertiser* with severe chastisement and well-merited contempt. The controversy is apparently not yet concluded; and should it appear to us to deserve any further notice at our hands, we shall review it as a whole in our next number.

Books Received.

- Aird (Thos.). Poetical Works. New Edition. Pp. 439. W. Blackwood & Sons.
 Beecher (Edward, D.D.). Papal Conspiracy Exposed. Pp. 351. Jas. Nichol.
 Block (Maurice). Dictionnaire de l'Administration Française. D. Nutt.
 Brown (H.). Albonia: a Pilgrimage. A Poem. Pp. 30. Charles Fox.
 British Controversialist and Self-Educator for March, 1856. Price 4d. Houlston & Stoneman.
 British Educator: a Monthly Magazine of Literature, Philosophy, Science, and Art. No. I., for March, 1856. Glasgow: Thos. Murray & Son.
 Cockburn (Samuel, M.D.). Medical Reform. Pp. 176. R. Theobald.
 Cresswell (Mrs. Frances). Memoir of Elizabeth Fry. Pp. 583. Piper & Co.
 Dickson (Rev. Jno. Bathurst). The Temple Lamp. Price 4d. Pp. 32. Jas. Nisbet & Co.
 Dodd (J. P., LL.D.). Ten Letters on Self-Education. 1s. Hamilton, Adams, & Co.
 Dodd (Geo.). The Food of London. Pp. 524. Longman & Co.
 Donaldson (Jno. W., D.D.). Classical Scholarship and Classical Learning. Pp. 259. Cambridge: Deighton & Bell.
 Evangelical Magazine and Missionary Chronicle for March, 1856. 6d. Ward & Co.
 Farrand (Banks). The Christian System; or, Teaching of the New Testament. Pp. 511. Longman & Co.
 Fergusson (Jas., M.R., I.B.A.). Illustrated Hand-book of Architecture. 2 Vols. Pp. 991. Jno. Murray.
 Fraser's Magazine for March, 1856. 2s. 6d. Pp. 378. Jno. W. Parker.
 Hardwick (Charles, M.A.). A History of the Christian Church during the Reformation. Pp. 448.
 Hervey (Rev. Lord Arthur, M.A.). The Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Five Sermons. Pp. 90. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.
 Hinton (Jno. Howard, M.A.). Twelve Lectures on Acquaintance with God. Pp. 273. Houlston & Stoneman.
 Illustrations to the Holy Scriptures. 18 Maps and Plans. S. Bagster & Sons.
 "It is written," or the Scriptures the Word of God. Pp. 194. S. Bagster & Son.
 Labarte (M. Jules). Hand-book of the Arts of the Middle Ages. Pp. 443. J. Murray.
 Leaves of Grass: a Poem. Pp. 95. W. Horsell.
 Leask (Wm.). The Beauties of the Bible. In Ten Lectures. 2nd Ed. Pp. 305. Partridge & Co.
 Lamps of the Temple: Crayon Sketches of the Men of the Modern Pulpit. 3rd Edition. Pp. 597. Jno. Snow.
 Leigh (Thos.). Garlands of Verse. Pp. 208. Smith, Elder, & Co.
 Monteith (Lient.-Gen.). Kars and Erzeroum: with the Campaigns of Prince Paskevitch in 1828 and 1829. Pp. 332. Longman & Co.
 Perry (Charles, D.D.). Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Pp. 135. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.
 Raikes (Thos., Esq.). A Portion of the Journal kept from 1831 to 1847: Social and Political Life in London and Paris. 2 Vols. Longman & Co.
 Ridgeway (Rev. J.). Rosalie; or, the Truth shall make you Free. 2nd Ed. Pp. 249. Hall, Virtue & Co.
 Simpson (J. W.). The Urgent Necessity for Tenant-Right Bill for Ireland. Pp. 32.
 Slack (R., M.D.). Old Truths and Modern Progress. Pp. 442. Hamilton & Co.
 The Great Arctic Mystery. Pp. 16. Chapman & Hall.
 The Crisis and Way of Escape. Pp. 24. 4d. Houlston and Stoneman.
 The Homilist and Bi-Monthly Pulpit Review for March, 1856. 1s. Ward & Co.
 Timbs (T., F.S.A.). Things Not Generally Known Familiarly Explained. Pp. 247. David Bogue.
 Tschudi (Frederick Von). Sketches of Nature in the Alps. In 2 Parts. Pp. 246. Longman & Co.
 Vaughan (R. A., B.A.). Hours with the Mystics. 2 Vols. Jno. W. Parker.
 Warton (Jno. Wood, B.D.). Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey. In 4 Vols. Vols. I. and II. Longman & Co.